arXiv:1002.3926v4 [math.CT] 9 Oct 2011

AUSLANDER-BUCHWEITZ APPROXIMATION THEORY FOR TRIANGULATED CATEGORIES

O. MENDOZA, E. C. SÁENZ, V. SANTIAGO, M. J. SOUTO SALORIO.

Abstract. We introduce and study the analogous of the Auslander-Buchweitz approximation theory (see [2]) for triangulated categories $\mathcal{T}$. We also relate different kinds of relative homological dimensions by using suitable subcategories of $\mathcal{T}$. Moreover, we establish the existence of preenvelopes (and precovers) in certain triangulated subcategories of $\mathcal{T}$.

Introduction.

The approximation theory has its origin with the concept of injective envelopes and it has had a wide development in the context of module categories since the fifties.

In independent papers, Auslander, Reiten and Smalo (for the category $\operatorname{mod}(\Lambda)$ of finitely generated modules over an artin algebra Λ), and Enochs (for the category $\operatorname{Mod}(R)$ of modules over an arbitrary ring R) introduced a general approximation theory involving precovers and preenvelopes (see [3], [4] and [9]).

Auslander and Buchweitz (see [2]) studied the ideas of injective envelopes and projective covers in terms of maximal Cohen-Macaulay approximations for certain modules. In their work, they also studied the relationship between the relative injective dimension and the coresolution dimension of a module. They developed their theory in the context of abelian categories providing important applications in several settings.

Based on [2], Hashimoto defined the so called “Auslander-Buchweitz context” for abelian categories, giving a new framework to homological approximation theory (see [10]).

Recently, triangulated categories entered into the subject in a relevant way and several authors have studied the concept of approximation in both contexts, abelian and triangulated categories (see, for example, [1] [7], [8] and [11]).

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 18E30 and 18G20. Secondary 18G25.
The authors thank the financial support received from Project PAPIIT-UNAM IN101607.

In this paper, we develop a relative homological theory for triangulated categories, we do so, similarly as it was done by Auslander and Buchweitz for abelian categories in [2]. Along this work, we denote by $\mathcal{T}$ an arbitrary triangulated category (no necessarily closed under arbitrary coproducts) and by $\mathcal{X}$ a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$.

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 1, we give some basic notions and properties of the theory of triangulated categories, that will be used in the rest of the work.

In Section 2, we study the notion of $\mathcal{X}$-resolution dimension which allows us to characterize (see Proposition 2.10) suspended subcategories of $\mathcal{T}$.

In Section 3, the properties of the $\mathcal{X}$-projective (respectively, $\mathcal{X}$-injective) dimension and its relation to the $\mathcal{X}$-resolution dimension (respectively, coresolution) are established. The main result of this section is the Theorem 3.4 that relates different kinds of relative homological dimensions by using suitable subcategories of $\mathcal{T}$.

In Section 4, we focus our attention to the notions of $\mathcal{X}$-injectives and weak-cogenerators in $\mathcal{X}$. These concepts will allow us to introduce in [12] the notion of the Auslander-Buchweitz context for triangulated categories. We relate these ideas to the concepts of injective and coresolution dimension. This leads us to characterize several subcategories that will be very useful in [12]. Moreover, in the Theorem 4.4 we establish the existence of $\mathcal{X}$-precovers and $\omega^{\wedge}$-preenvelopes.

In a forthcoming paper (see [12]), a connection between Auslander-Buchweitz contexts and co-t-structures is established. The term co-t-structure first appeared in [13]. This concept corresponds to the notion of weight structure studied by Bondarko (see [6]) in the context of triangulated categories with arbitrary coproducts. In [6], weight structures are studied in connection with the theory of motives and stable homotopy theory. It seems to be that co-t-structures are more relevant for general triangulated categories than the so called t-structures since they exists more often than t-structures and still contain all the information on their "adjacent t-structures" (see [6]).

1. Preliminaries

Throughout this paper, $\mathcal{T}$ will be a triangulated category and $\Sigma : \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{T}$ its suspension functor. For the sake of tradition, we set $X[n] := \Sigma^n X$ for any integer n and any object $X \in \mathcal{T}$. All the subcategories of $\mathcal{T}$ to be considered in this paper will be full, additive and closed under isomorphisms.

An important tool, which is a consequence of the octahedral axiom in $\mathcal{T}$, is the so-called co-base change. That is, for any diagram in $\mathcal{T}$

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & Y \\
Z &
\end{tikzcd}$$

there exists a commutative and exact diagram in $\mathcal{T}$

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & W[-1] \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d] & W[-1] \arrow[d] & \\
U[-1] \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & X \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & Y \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & U \arrow[d, equal] \\
U[-1] \arrow[r] & Z \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & E \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & U \\
 & W \arrow[r, equal] & W &
\end{tikzcd}$$

where exact means that the rows and columns, in the preceding diagram, are distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$. The base change, which is the dual notion of co-base change, also holds.

Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. We put ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{X} := \{Z \in \mathcal{T} : \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(Z,-)|_{\mathcal{X}} = 0\}$ and $\mathcal{X}^{\perp} := \{Z \in \mathcal{T} : \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(-,Z)|_{\mathcal{X}} = 0\}$. We denote by $\mathcal{X} * \mathcal{Y}$ the class of objects $Z \in \mathcal{T}$ for which exists a distinguished triangle $X \to Z \to Y \to X[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$. It is also well known that the operation $*$ is associative (see [5, 1.3.10]). Furthermore, it is said that $\mathcal{X}$ is **closed under extensions** if $\mathcal{X} * \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$.

Recall that a class $\mathcal{X}$ of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ is said to be **suspended** (respectively, **cosuspended**) if $\mathcal{X}[1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ (respectively, $\mathcal{X}[-1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}$) and $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under extensions. By the following lemma, it is easy to see, that a suspended (cosuspended) class $\mathcal{X}$ of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, can be considered as a full additive subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$.

Lemma 1.1. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$.*

(a) *If $0 \in \mathcal{X}$ then $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \mathcal{Y}$ for any class $\mathcal{Y}$ of objects in $\mathcal{T}$.*
(b) *If $\mathcal{X}$ is suspended (cosuspended), then $0 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X} * \mathcal{X}$.*

Proof. (a) If $0 \in \mathcal{X}$ then we get $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \mathcal{Y}$ by using the distinguished triangle $0 \to Y \xrightarrow{1_Y} Y \to 0$ for any $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$.

(b) Let $\mathcal{X}$ be cosuspended (the other case, is analogous). Then, it follows that $0 \in \mathcal{X}$ since we have the distinguished triangle $X[-1] \to 0 \to X \to X$ for any $X \in \mathcal{X}$. Hence (b) follows from (a). $\Box$

Given a class $\mathcal{X}$ of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, it is said that $\mathcal{X}$ is **closed under cones** if for any distinguished triangle $A \to B \to C \to A[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $A, B \in \mathcal{X}$ we have that $C \in \mathcal{X}$. Similarly, $\mathcal{X}$ is **closed under cocones** if for any distinguished triangle $A \to B \to C \to A[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $B, C \in \mathcal{X}$ we have that $A \in \mathcal{X}$.

We denote by $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ (respectively, ${}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}$) the smallest suspended (respectively, cosuspended) subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ containing the class $\mathcal{X}$. Note that if $\mathcal{X}$ is suspended (respectively, cosuspended) subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$, then $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ (respectively, $\mathcal{X} = {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}$). We also recall that a subcategory $\mathcal{U}$ of $\mathcal{T}$, which is suspended and cosuspended, is called **triangulated subcategory** of $\mathcal{T}$. A **thick** subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ is a triangulated subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ which is closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$. We also denote by $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{X}}$ the smallest thick subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ containing the class $\mathcal{X}$.

Finally, we recall the following definition (see [3], [7], [8] and [9]).

Definition 1.2. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be classes of objects in the triangulated category $\mathcal{T}$. A morphism $f : X \to C$ in $\mathcal{T}$ is said to be an* $\mathcal{X}$**-precover** *of C if $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X', f) : \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X', X) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X', C)$ is surjective $\forall X' \in \mathcal{X}$. If any $C \in \mathcal{Y}$ admits an $\mathcal{X}$-precover, then $\mathcal{X}$ is called a* **precovering class** *in $\mathcal{Y}$. By dualizing the definition above, we get the notion of an* $\mathcal{X}$**-preenveloping** *of C and a* **preenveloping class** *in $\mathcal{Y}$.*

2. RESOLUTION AND CORESOLUTION DIMENSIONS

Now, we define certain classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ which will lead us to the notions of resolution and coresolution dimensions.

Definition 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. For any natural number n, we introduce inductively the class $\varepsilon_n^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})$ as follows: $\varepsilon_0^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X}) := \mathcal{X}$ and assuming defined $\varepsilon_{n-1}^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})$, the class $\varepsilon_n^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})$ is given by all the objects $Z \in \mathcal{T}$ for which exists a distinguished triangle in $\mathcal{T}$*

$$Z[-1] \longrightarrow W \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow Z$$

with $W \in \varepsilon_{n-1}^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})$ and $X \in \mathcal{X}$.

Dually, we set $\varepsilon_0^{\vee}(\mathcal{X}) := \mathcal{X}$ and supposing defined $\varepsilon_{n-1}^{\vee}(\mathcal{X})$, the class $\varepsilon_n^{\vee}(\mathcal{X})$ is formed for all the objects $Z \in \mathcal{T}$ for which exists a distinguished triangle in $\mathcal{T}$

$$Z \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow K \longrightarrow Z[1]$$

with $K \in \varepsilon_{n-1}^{\vee}(\mathcal{X})$ and $X \in \mathcal{X}$.

We have the following properties for $\varepsilon_n^{\vee}(\mathcal{X})$ (and the similar ones for $\varepsilon_n^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})$).

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a triangulated category and n a natural number. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) *For any $Z \in \mathcal{T}$ and $n > 0$, we have that $Z \in \varepsilon_n^{\vee}(\mathcal{X})$ if and only if there is a family $\{K_j \to X_j \to K_{j+1} \to K_j[1], \quad 0 \leq j \leq n-1\}$ of distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$ with $K_0 = Z$, $X_j \in \mathcal{X}$ and $K_n \in \mathcal{X}$.*

(b) *$\varepsilon_n^{\vee}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \varepsilon_{n+2}^{\vee}(\mathcal{X})$ and $0 \in \varepsilon_1^{\vee}(\mathcal{X})$.*

(c) *If $0 \in \mathcal{X}$ then $\mathcal{X}[-j] \subseteq \varepsilon_j^{\vee}(\mathcal{X})$ for all $j \geq 0$.*

Proof. (a) If $n = 1$ then the equivalence follows from the definition of $\varepsilon_1^{\vee}(\mathcal{X})$. Let $n \geq 2$ and suppose (by induction) that the equivalence is true for $\varepsilon_{n-1}^{\vee}(\mathcal{X})$. By definition, $Z \in \varepsilon_n^{\vee}(\mathcal{X})$ if and only if there is a distinguished triangle in $\mathcal{T}$

$$Z \longrightarrow X_0 \longrightarrow K_1 \longrightarrow Z[1]$$

with $K_1 \in \varepsilon_{n-1}^{\vee}(\mathcal{X})$ and $X_0 \in \mathcal{X}$. On the other hand, by induction, we have that $K_1 \in \varepsilon_{n-1}^{\vee}(\mathcal{X})$ if and only if there is a family $\{K_j \to X_j \to K_{j+1} \to K_j[1] \; 1 \leq j \leq n-1\}$ of distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X_j \in \mathcal{X}$ and $K_n \in \mathcal{X}$; proving (a).

(b) Let $X \in \mathcal{X}$. Since $0 \to X \overset{1_X}{\to} X \to 0$ is a distinguished triangle in $\mathcal{T}$, it follows that $0 \in \varepsilon_1^{\vee}(\mathcal{X})$. On the other hand, using the distinguished triangle $X \overset{1_X}{\to} X \to 0 \to X[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ and since $0 \in \varepsilon_1^{\vee}(\mathcal{X})$, it follows that $\varepsilon_0^{\vee}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \varepsilon_2^{\vee}(\mathcal{X})$. Let $Z \in \varepsilon_n^{\vee}(\mathcal{X})$. Consider the distinguished triangle $Z \to X \to K \to Z[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $K \in \varepsilon_{n-1}^{\vee}(\mathcal{X})$. By induction $\varepsilon_{n-1}^{\vee}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \varepsilon_{n+1}^{\vee}(\mathcal{X})$ and so $Z \in \varepsilon_{n+2}^{\vee}(\mathcal{X})$; proving (b).

(c) Let $0 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $X \in \mathcal{X}$. Since $X[-1] \to 0 \to X \overset{1_X}{\to} X$ is a distinguished triangle in $\mathcal{T}$, we get that $X[-1] \in \varepsilon_1^{\vee}(\mathcal{X})$. From the distinguished triangle $X[-j] \to 0 \to X[-(j-1)] \overset{1}{\to} X[-(j-1)]$ and induction on j, it follows that $X[-j] \in \varepsilon_j^{\vee}(\mathcal{X})$. □

Following [2] and [7], we introduce the notion of $\mathcal{X}$-resolution (respectively, coresolution) dimension of any class $\mathcal{Y}$ of objects of $\mathcal{T}$.

Definition 2.3. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$.*

(a) *$\mathcal{X}^{\wedge} := \cup_{n \geq 0} \, \varepsilon_n^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\mathcal{X}^{\vee} := \cup_{n \geq 0} \, \varepsilon_n^{\vee}(\mathcal{X})$.*

(b) *For any $M \in \mathcal{T}$, the $\mathcal{X}$-**resolution dimension** of M is $\operatorname{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) := \min\{n \geq 0 \; : \; M \in \varepsilon_n^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})\}$ if $M \in \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$; otherwise $\operatorname{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) := \infty$. Dually, the $\mathcal{X}$-**coresolution dimension** of M is $\operatorname{coresdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) := \min\{n \geq 0 \; : \; M \in \varepsilon_n^{\vee}(\mathcal{X})\}$ if $M \in \mathcal{X}^{\vee}$; otherwise $\operatorname{coresdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) := \infty$.*

(c) *For any subclass $\mathcal{Y}$ of $\mathcal{T}$, we set $\operatorname{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) := \max\{\operatorname{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) \; : \; M \in \mathcal{Y}\}$. Similarly, we also have $\operatorname{coresdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y})$.*

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ with $0 \in \mathcal{X}$. Then, $\varepsilon_n^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})[1] \subseteq \varepsilon_{n+1}^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$; and hence $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ is closed under positive shifts.*

Proof. Let $Z \in \varepsilon_n^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})$. Using the distinguished triangle $Z \overset{1_Z}{\to} Z \to 0 \to Z[1]$, we get the result. $\square$

Remark 2.5. (1) *Observe that a suspended class $\mathcal{U}$ of $\mathcal{T}$ is closed under cones. Indeed, if $A \to B \to C \to A[1]$ is a distinguished triangle in $\mathcal{T}$ with $A, B \in \mathcal{U}$ then $A[1], B \in \mathcal{U}$; and so we get $C \in \mathcal{U}$. Similarly, if $\mathcal{U}$ is cosuspended then it is closed under cocones.*

(2) *Let $(\mathcal{Y}, \omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ with $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$. If $\mathcal{Y}$ is closed under cones (respectively, cocones) then $\omega^{\wedge} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$ (respectively, $\omega^{\vee} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$). Indeed, assume that $\mathcal{Y}$ is closed under cones and let $M \in \omega^{\wedge}$. Thus $M \in \varepsilon_n^{\wedge}(\omega)$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If $n = 0$ then $M \in \omega \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$. Let $n > 0$, and hence there is a distinguished triangle $M[-1] \to K \to Y \to M$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $K \in \varepsilon_{n-1}^{\wedge}(\omega)$ and $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$. By induction $K \in \mathcal{Y}$ and hence $M \in \mathcal{Y}$ since $\mathcal{Y}$ is closed under cones; proving that $\omega^{\wedge} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$.*

(3) *Note that $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ (respectively, $\mathcal{X}^{\vee} \subseteq {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}$) since $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ (respectively, ${}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}$) is closed under cones (respectively, cocones) and contains $\mathcal{X}$.*

Using the fact that the functor Hom is a cohomological one, we get the following description of the orthogonal categories. In particular, observe that ${}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}$ (respectively, ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$) is a suspended (respectively, cosuspended) subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$.

Lemma 2.6. *For any class $\mathcal{X}$ of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, we have that*

(a) ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}} = \{Z \in \mathcal{T} \ : \ \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(Z, X[i]) = 0, \quad \forall i \geq 0, \forall X \in \mathcal{X}\}$,

(b) ${}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp} = \{Z \in \mathcal{T} \ : \ \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X[i], Z) = 0, \quad \forall i \leq 0, \forall X \in \mathcal{X}\}$.

Proof. It is straightforward. $\square$

Lemma 2.7. *Let $\mathcal{Y}$ and $\mathcal{X}$ be classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, $n \geq 1$ and $Z \in \mathcal{T}$. The following statements hold.*

(a) *The object Z belongs to $\mathcal{Y} * \mathcal{Y}[1] * \cdots * \mathcal{Y}[n-1] * \mathcal{X}[n]$ if and only if there exists a family $\{K_i \to Y_i \to K_{i+1} \to K_i[1] \ : \ Y_i \in \mathcal{Y}, \ 0 \leq i \leq n-1\}$ of distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$ with $K_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $Z = K_n$.*

(b) *The object Z belongs to $\mathcal{X}[-n] * \mathcal{Y}[-n+1] * \cdots * \mathcal{Y}[-1] * \mathcal{Y}$ if and only if there exists a family $\{K_{i+1} \to Y_i \to K_i \to K_{i+1}[1] \ : \ Y_i \in \mathcal{Y}, \ 0 \leq i \leq n-1\}$ of distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$ with $K_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $Z = K_n$.*

Proof. (a) We proceed by induction on n. If $n = 1$ then (a) is trivial. Suppose that $n \geq 2$ and consider the class

$$\mathcal{Z}_{n-1} := \mathcal{Y} * \mathcal{Y}[1] * \cdots * \mathcal{Y}[n-2] * \mathcal{X}[n-1].$$

It is clear that $\mathcal{Y} * \mathcal{Y}[1] * \cdots * \mathcal{Y}[n-1] * \mathcal{X}[n] = \mathcal{Y} * \mathcal{Z}_{n-1}[1]$; and then, we have that $Z \in \mathcal{Y} * \mathcal{Y}[1] * \cdots * \mathcal{Y}[n-1] * \mathcal{X}[n]$ if and only if there is a distinguished triangle

$$K \longrightarrow Y \longrightarrow Z \longrightarrow K[1]$$

in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $K \in \mathcal{Z}_{n-1}$. On the other hand, by induction, we have that $K \in \mathcal{Z}_{n-1}$ if and only if there is a family $\{K_i \to Y_i \to K_{i+1} \to K_i[1] \,:\, Y_i \in \mathcal{Y},\ 0 \leq i \leq n-2\}$ of distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$ with $K_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $K = K_{n-1}$. So the result follows by adding the triangle above to the preceeding family of triangles.

(b) It is similar to (a). □

Corollary 2.8. *Let $\mathcal{Y}$ be a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, $n \geq 1$ and $Z, K \in \mathcal{T}$. The object Z belongs to $\mathcal{Y} * \mathcal{Y}[1] * \cdots * \mathcal{Y}[n-1] * K[n]$ if and only if K belongs to $Z[-n] * \mathcal{Y}[-n+1] * \cdots * \mathcal{Y}[-1] * \mathcal{Y}$.*

Proof. It follows from 2.7 by taking $\mathcal{X} = \{K\}$ in (a) and $\mathcal{X} = \{Z\}$ in (b). □

Corollary 2.9. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) $\varepsilon_n^{\wedge}(\mathcal{Y}) = \mathcal{Y} * \mathcal{Y}[1] * \cdots * \mathcal{Y}[n]$ *for any* $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
(b) $\operatorname{resdim}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X}) \leq n < \infty$ *if and only if* $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{Y} * \mathcal{Y}[1] * \cdots * \mathcal{Y}[n]$.
(c) *If* $\mathcal{X} * \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ *then* $\mathcal{X} * \mathcal{X}^{\wedge} \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$.

Proof. The item (a) follows from 2.7 and 2.1. The proof of (b) and (c) are obtained from (a). □

The following result will be useful in this paper. The item (a) already appeared in [7]. We also recall that $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{X}}$ stands for the smallest thick subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ containing the class of objects $\mathcal{X}$.

Proposition 2.10. *For any cosuspended subcategory $\mathcal{X}$ of $\mathcal{T}$ and any object $C \in \mathcal{T}$, the following statements hold.*

(a) $\operatorname{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) \leq n$ *if and only if* $C \in \mathcal{X}[n]$.
(b) $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge} = \cup_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{X}[n]$ *and* $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ *is the smallest triangulated subcategory of* $\mathcal{T}$ *containing* $\mathcal{X}$.
(c) *If* $\mathcal{X}$ *is closed under direct summands in* $\mathcal{T}$, *then* $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{X}} = \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$.

Proof. (a) We assert that $\mathcal{X} * \mathcal{X}[1] * \cdots * \mathcal{X}[n] = \mathcal{X}[n]$ for any $n \geq 1$. Indeed, since $0 \in \mathcal{X}$ (see 1.1 (b)), it follows that $\mathcal{X}[n] \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \mathcal{X}[1] * \cdots * \mathcal{X}[n]$ (see 1.1 (a)). On the other hand, using that $\mathcal{X} * \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{X}[-1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, it follows that $\mathcal{X} * \mathcal{X}[1] * \cdots * \mathcal{X}[n] = (\mathcal{X}[-n] * \mathcal{X}[-n+1] * \cdots * \mathcal{X})[n] \subseteq (\mathcal{X} * \cdots * \mathcal{X})[n] \subseteq \mathcal{X}[n]$; proving the assertion. Hence (a) follows from the assertion above and 2.9 (a).

(b) From (a), we get the equality in (b); and hence it follows that $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ is closed under positive and negative shifts. We prove now that $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ is closed under extensions. Indeed, let $X[n] \to Y \to X'[m] \to X[n][1]$ be a distinguished triangle in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X, X' \in \mathcal{X}$. We may assume that $n \leq m$ and then $X[n] = X[n-m][m] \in \mathcal{X}[m]$ since $n - m \leq 0$ and $\mathcal{X}[-1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. Using now that $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under extensions, it follows that $Y \in \mathcal{X}[m] \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$; proving that $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ is closed under extensions. Hence $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ is a triangulated subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ and moreover it is the smallest one containing $\mathcal{X}$ since $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge} = \cup_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{X}[n]$.

(c) It follows from (b). □

3. Relative homological dimensions

In this section, we introduce the $\mathcal{X}$-projective (respectively, injective) dimension of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. Moreover, we stablish a result that relates this relative projective dimension with the resolution dimension as can be seen in the Theorem 3.4.

Definition 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ and M an object in $\mathcal{T}$.*

(a) *The* **$\mathcal{X}$-projective dimension** *of M is*

$$\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) := \min\{n \geq 0 : \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(M[-i], -)\,|_{\mathcal{X}} = 0, \quad \forall i > n\}.$$

(b) *The* **$\mathcal{X}$-injective dimension** *of M is*

$$\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) := \min\{n \geq 0 : \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(-, M[i])\,|_{\mathcal{X}} = 0, \quad \forall i > n\}.$$

(c) *For any class $\mathcal{Y}$ of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, we set*

$$\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) := \max\{\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) \,:\, C \in \mathcal{Y}\} \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) := \max\{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) \,:\, C \in \mathcal{Y}\}.$$

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) *For any $M \in \mathcal{T}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have that*
  (a1) $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) \leq n$ *if and only if* $M \in {}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}[n+1]$;
  (a2) $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) \leq n$ *if and only if* $M \in {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-n-1]$.

(b) $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X}) = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y})$ *for any class $\mathcal{Y}$ of objects in $\mathcal{T}$.*

Proof. (a) follows from 2.6, and (b) is straightforward. □

Proposition 3.3. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ and $M \in \mathcal{T}$. Then*

$$\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) = \mathrm{resdim}_{{}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}[1]}(M) \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) = \mathrm{coresdim}_{{}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1]}(M).$$

Proof. Since ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is cosuspended (see 2.6 (a)), the first equality follows from 3.2 (a1) and 2.10 (a). The second equality can be proven similarly. □

Now, we prove the following relationship between the relative projective dimension and the resolution dimension.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) \leq \mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) + \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{Y}}(L), \quad \forall L \in \mathcal{T}.$

(b) *If $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}} \cap {}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}[1]$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ is closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$, then*

$$\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) = \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{Y}}(L), \quad \forall L \in \mathcal{Y}^{\wedge}.$$

Proof. (a) Let $d := \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{Y}}(L)$ and $\alpha := \mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y})$. We may assume that d and α are finite. We prove (a) by induction on d. If $d = 0$, it follows that $L \in \mathcal{Y}$ and then (a) holds in this case.
Assume that $d \geq 1$. So we have a distinguished triangle $K \to Y \to L \to K[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $K \in \varepsilon^{\wedge}_{d-1}(\mathcal{Y})$. Applying the cohomological functor $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(-, M[j])$, with $M \in \mathcal{X}$, to the above triangle, we get and exact sequence of abelian groups

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(K[1], M[j]) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(L, M[j]) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(Y, M[j]).$$

By induction, we know that $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(K) \leq \alpha + d - 1$. Therefore $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(L, M[j]) = 0$ for $j > \alpha + d$ and so $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) \leq \alpha + d$.

(b) Let $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}} \cap^{\perp} \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}[1]$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$. Consider $L \in \mathcal{Y}^{\wedge}$ and let $d := \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{Y}}(L)$. By 3.2 we have that $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) = 0$ and then $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) \leq d$ (see (a)). We prove, by induction on d, that the equality given in (b) holds. For $d = 0$ it is clear.
Suppose that $d = 1$. Then, there is a distinguished triangle

$$\eta : \quad Y_1 \to Y_0 \to L \xrightarrow{f} Y_1[1] \text{ in } \mathcal{T} \text{ with } Y_i \in \mathcal{Y}.$$

If $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) = 0$ then $L \in {}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}[1]$ (see 3.2). Hence $f = 0$ since $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$; and therefore η splits giving us that $L \in \mathcal{Y}$, which is a contradiction since $d = 1$. So $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) > 0$ proving (b) for $d = 1$.
Assume now that $d \geq 2$. Thus we have a distinguished triangle $K \to Y \to L \to K[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, $K \in \varepsilon^{\wedge}_{d-1}(\mathcal{Y})$ and $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(K) = d - 1$ (by inductive hypothesis). Since $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) \leq d$, it is enough to see $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) > d - 1$. So, in case $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) \leq d - 1$, we apply the cohomological functor $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(-, X[d])$, with $X \in \mathcal{X}$, to the triangle $L \to K[1] \to Y[1] \to L[1]$. Then we get the following exact sequence of abelian groups

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(Y[1], X[d]) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(K[1], X[d]) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(L, X[d]).$$

Therefore $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(K[1], X[d]) = 0$ contradicting that $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(K) = d - 1$. This means that $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) > d - 1$; proving (b). □

Remark 3.5. *Note that if* $Y \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}} \cap {}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}[1]$ *then* $Y[j] \notin \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}} \cap {}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}[1]$ $\forall j > 0$.

The following technical result will be used in the Section 4.

Lemma 3.6. *Let* $\mathcal{X}$, $\mathcal{Y}$ *and* $\mathcal{Z}$ *be classes of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$. *Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee}) = \mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X})$.

(b) *If* $\mathcal{X} \subseteq Z \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{\vee}$ *then* $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{Z}) = \mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X})$.

Proof. To prove (a), it is enough to see that $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee}) \leq \mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X})$. Let $M \in \mathcal{X}^{\vee}$. We prove by induction on $d := \mathrm{coresdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(M)$ that $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(M) \leq \mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X})$. We may assume that $\alpha := \mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X}) < \infty$. If $d = 0$ then we have that $M \in \mathcal{X}$ and there is nothing to prove.

Let $d \geq 1$. Then we have a distinguished triangle $M \to X \to K \to M[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X \in \mathcal{X}$, $K \in \varepsilon^{\vee}_{d-1}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(K) \leq \alpha$ (by inductive hypothesis). Applying the cohomological functor $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(-, Y[i])$, with $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, we get the exact sequence of abelian groups

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X, Y[i]) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(M, Y[i]) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(K, Y[i+1]).$$

Therefore $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(M, Y[i]) = 0$ for $i > \alpha$ since $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(K) \leq \alpha$. So we get that $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee}) \leq \mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X})$.

Finally, it is easy to see that (b) is a consequence of (a). $\square$

The following two lemmas resembles the so called "shifting argument" that is usually used for syzygies and cosyzygies in the Ext^n functor.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ such that* $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) = 0$. *Then, for any $X \in \mathcal{X}$, $k > 0$ and $K_n \in \mathcal{Y} * \mathcal{Y}[1] * \cdots * \mathcal{Y}[n-1] * K_0[n]$, there is an isomorphism of abelian groups*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X, K_0[k+n]) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X, K_n[k]).$$

Proof. Let $X \in \mathcal{X}$, $k > 0$ and $K_n \in \mathcal{Y} * \mathcal{Y}[1] * \cdots * \mathcal{Y}[n-1] * K_0[n]$. By 2.7 (a), we have distinguished triangles $\eta_i : \quad K_i \to Y_i \to K_{i+1} \to K_i[1]$ with $Y_i \in \mathcal{Y},\ 0 \leq i \leq n-1$. Applying the functor $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X[-k], -)$ to η_i, we get the exact sequence of abelian groups

$$(X[-k], Y_i) \to (X[-k], K_{i+1}) \to (X[-k], K_i[1]) \to (X[-k], Y_i[1]),$$

where $(-,-) := \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(-,-)$ for simplicity. Since $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) = 0$, it follows that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X[-k], K_{i+1}) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X[-k], K_i[1])$. Therefore, by the preceding isomorphism, we have
$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X, K_n[k]) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X, K_{n-1}[k+1]) \simeq \cdots \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X, K_0[k+n])$. $\square$

Lemma 3.8. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ such that* $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) = 0$. *Then, for any $X \in \mathcal{X}$, $k > 0$ and $K_n \in K_0[-n] * \mathcal{Y}[-n+1] * \cdots * \mathcal{Y}[-1] * \mathcal{Y}$, there is an isomorphism of abelian groups*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(K_0, X[k+n]) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{T}(K_n, X[k]).$$

Proof. The proof is similar to the one given in 3.7 by using 2.7 (b). $\square$

4. RELATIVE WEAK-COGENERATORS AND RELATIVE INJECTIVES

In this section, we focus our attention on pairs $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. We study the relationship between weak-cogenerators in $\mathcal{X}$ and coresolutions. Also, we give a characterization of some special subcategories of $\mathcal{T}$.

Definition 4.1. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. We say that*

(a) *ω is a* **weak-cogenerator** *in $\mathcal{X}$, if $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{X}[-1] * \omega$;*

(b) *ω is a* **weak-generator** *in $\mathcal{X}$, if $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{X} \subseteq \omega * \mathcal{X}[1]$;*

(c) *ω is **$\mathcal{X}$-injective** if $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega)=0$; and dually, ω is **$\mathcal{X}$-projective** if $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega)=0$.*

The following result say us that an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator, closed under direct summands, is unique (in case there exists).

Proposition 4.2. *Let $(\mathcal{X},\omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ such that ω is $\mathcal{X}$-injective. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) *$\omega^\wedge$ is $\mathcal{X}$-injective.*

(b) *If ω is a weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$, and ω is closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$, then*

$$\omega=\mathcal{X}\cap{}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1]=\mathcal{X}\cap\omega^{\wedge}.$$

Proof. (a) It follows from the dual result of 3.6 (a).

(b) Let $\omega\subseteq\mathcal{X}\subseteq\mathcal{X}[-1]*\omega$ and ω be closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$.

We start by proving the first equality. Let $X\in\mathcal{X}\cap{}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1]$. Since $\mathcal{X}\subseteq\mathcal{X}[-1]*\omega$, there is a distinguished triangle

$$\eta:\quad X\to W\to X'\xrightarrow{f}X[1]\text{ in }\mathcal{T}\text{ with }X'\in\mathcal{X}\text{ and }W\in\omega.$$

Moreover $X\in{}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1]$ implies that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(-,X[1])|_{\mathcal{X}}=0$ (see 2.6 (b)). Hence η splits and so $X\in\omega$; proving that $\mathcal{X}\cap{}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1]\subseteq\omega$. The other inclusion follows from 3.2 (a2) since $\omega\subseteq\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega)=0$.

On the other hand, it is easy to see that $\omega\subseteq\mathcal{X}\cap\omega^{\wedge}$ and since $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega^{\wedge})=0$, it follows from 3.2 (a2) that $\mathcal{X}\cap\omega^{\wedge}\subseteq\mathcal{X}\cap{}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1]$; proving (b). □

Proposition 4.3. *Let $(\mathcal{X},\omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, and ω be closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$. If ω is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$, then*

$$\mathcal{X}\cap\omega^{\vee}=\{X\in\mathcal{X}\,:\,\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(X)<\infty\}.$$

Proof. Let $M\in\mathcal{X}\cap\omega^{\vee}$. We assert that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(M)\le d<\infty$ where $d:=\mathrm{coresdim}_{\omega}(M)$. Indeed, from 2.2 (a) and 2.7 (a), there is some $W_d\in\omega*\omega[1]*\cdots*\omega[d-1]*M[d]$ with $W_d\in\omega$. So, by 3.7 we get an isomorphism $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X,M[k+d])\simeq\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X,W_d[k])$ for any $k>0$; and using that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega)=0$, it follows that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X,M[k+d])=0$ for any $k>0$, proving that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(M)\le d$.

Let $N\in\mathcal{X}$ be such that $n:=\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(N)<\infty$. Using that $\mathcal{X}\subseteq\mathcal{X}[-1]*\omega$, we can construct a family $\{K_i\to W_i\to K_{i+1}\to K_i[1]\,:\,W_i\in\omega,\ 0\le i\le n-1\}$ of distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$ where $K_0:=N$ and $K_i\in\mathcal{X}$, $\forall i\ 0\le i\le n$. Thus, by 2.7 (a), it follows that $K_n\in\omega*\omega[1]*\cdots*\omega[n-1]*N[n]$; and so by 3.7 we get that $\mathrm{Hom}_{T}(X,K_n[k])\simeq\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X,N[k+n])$, $\forall X\in\mathcal{X}$, $\forall k>0$. But $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X,N[k+n])=0$, $\forall X\in\mathcal{X}$, $\forall k>0$ because $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(N)=n$. Therefore $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(K_n)=0$ and then $K_n\in\omega$ (see 3.2 and 4.2 (b)); proving that $N\in\mathcal{X}\cap\omega^{\vee}$. □

Now, we are in condition to prove the following result. In the statement, we use the notions of precovering and preenveloping classes (see Section 1).

Theorem 4.4. *Let $(\mathcal{X},\omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, $\mathcal{X}$ be closed under extensions and ω be a weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) *For all $C\in\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ there exist two distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$:*
$C[-1]\longrightarrow Y_C\longrightarrow X_C\xrightarrow{\varphi_C} C$ *with* $Y_C\in\omega^\wedge$ *and* $X_C\in\mathcal{X}$,

$C\xrightarrow{\varphi^C} Y^C\longrightarrow X^C\longrightarrow C[1]$ *with* $Y^C\in\omega^\wedge$ *and* $X^C\in\mathcal{X}$.

(b) *If ω is $\mathcal{X}$-injective, then*

- (b1) $Y_C[1]\in\mathcal{X}^\perp$ *and* φ_C *is an* $\mathcal{X}$*-precover of* C,
- (b2) $X^C[-1]\in{}^\perp(\omega^\wedge)$ *and* φ^C *is a* $\omega^\wedge$*-preenvelope of* C.

Proof. (a) Let $C\in\mathcal{X}^\wedge$. We prove the existence of the triangles in (a) by induction on $n:=\operatorname{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(C)$. If $n=0$, we have that $C\in\mathcal{X}$ and then we can consider $C[-1]\to 0\to C\overset{1_C}{\to} C$ as the first triangle; the second one can be obtained from the fact that $\mathcal{X}\subseteq\mathcal{X}[-1]*\omega$.

Assume that $n>0$. Then, we have a distinguished triangle $C[-1]\to K_1\to X_0\to C$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X_0\in\mathcal{X}$ and $\operatorname{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(K_1)=n-1$. Hence, by induction, there is a distinguished triangle $K_1\to Y^{K_1}\to X^{K_1}\to K_1[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y^{K_1}\in\omega^\wedge$ and $X^{K_1}\in\mathcal{X}$. By the co-base change procedure applied to the above triangles, there exists a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & X^{K_1}[-1] \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d] & X^{K_1}[-1] \arrow[d] & \\
C[-1] \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & K_1 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & X_0 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & C \arrow[d, equal] \\
C[-1] \arrow[r] & Y^{K_1} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & U \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & C \\
 & X^{K_1} \arrow[r, equal] & X^{K_1} &
\end{tikzcd}$$

where the rows and columns are distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$. Since $X_0, X^{K_1}\in\mathcal{X}$ it follows that $U\in\mathcal{X}$. By taking $X_C:=U$ and $Y_C:=Y^{K_1}$, we get the first triangle in (a). On the other hand, since $U\in\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{X}\subseteq\mathcal{X}[-1]*\omega$, there exists a distinguished triangle $X^C[-1]\to U\to W\to X^C$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X^C\in\mathcal{X}$ and $W\in\omega$. Again, by the co-base change procedure, there exists a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & Y^{K_1} \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d] & Y^{K_1} \arrow[d] & \\
X^C[-1] \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & U \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & W \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & X^C \arrow[d, equal] \\
X^C[-1] \arrow[r] & C \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & Y^C \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & X^C \\
 & Y^{K_1}[1] \arrow[r, equal] & Y^{K_1}[1] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

where the rows and columns are distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$. By the second column, in the diagram above, it follows that $Y^C \in \omega^\wedge$. Hence the second row in the preceding diagram is the desired triangle.

(b) (b2) Consider the triangle $X^C[-1] \overset{g}{\to} C \overset{\varphi^C}{\to} Y^C \to X^C$ with $Y^C \in \omega^\wedge$ and $X^C \in \mathcal{X}$. Since $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega) = 0$ we have by 4.2 that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega^\wedge) = 0$. Thus $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X[-1], -)|_{\omega^\wedge} = 0$ for any $X \in \mathcal{X}$; and so $X^C[-1] \in {}^\perp(\omega^\wedge)$. Let $f : C \to Y$ be a morphism in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y \in \omega^\wedge$. Since $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X^C[-1], Y) = 0$, we have that $fg = 0$ and hence f factors through φ^C; proving that φ^C is a $\omega^\wedge$-preenvelope of C.

(b1) It is similar to the proof of (b2). □

The following result provides a characterization of the category $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$.

Corollary 4.5. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ such that $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under extensions and ω is a weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) *If $0 \in \omega$ then $\mathcal{X}^\wedge = \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge = \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge[1]$.*

(b) *If $\mathcal{X}[-1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ then $\mathcal{X}^\wedge = \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge = \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge[1] = \mathcal{X}[-1] * \omega^\wedge$.*

Proof. We assert that $\mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge$. Indeed, since $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ it follows from 2.9 (a) that $\varepsilon_n^\wedge(\omega) \subseteq \varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$, giving us that $\omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge$. Hence $\mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \mathcal{X}^\wedge$ and then $\mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge$ by 2.9 (c).

(a) Let $0 \in \omega$. By 4.4 (a) we have that $\mathcal{X}^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge[1]$, and therefore, by 2.4 (a) we get $\mathcal{X}^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge[1] \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge$. But $\mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \mathcal{X}^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge$ by 2.9 (c), and then $\mathcal{X}^\wedge = \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge = \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge[1]$.

(b) Let $\mathcal{X}[-1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. By 4.4 (a) and the assertion above, we have $\mathcal{X}^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X}[-1] * \omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge$. On the other hand, from 4.4 (a), it follows that $\mathcal{X}^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge[1]$. So, to prove (b), it is enough to see that $\mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge[1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge$. Let $C \in \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge[1]$. Then there is a distinguished triangle $Y \to X \to C \to Y[1]$ in

$\mathcal{T}$ with $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $Y \in \omega^\wedge$. Hence it follows that $C \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge$ since $\omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge$; proving (b). $\square$

We are now in position to prove that if ω is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator in a suitable class $\mathcal{X}$, then the $\omega^\wedge$-projective dimension coincides with the $\mathcal{X}$-resolution dimension for every object of the thick subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ generated by $\mathcal{X}$.

Theorem 4.6. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ which are closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$. If $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under extensions and ω is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$, then*

$$\mathrm{pd}_{\omega^\wedge}(C) = \mathrm{pd}_{\omega}(C) = \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(C), \quad \forall C \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge.$$

Proof. Let $C \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge$. By 3.2 (b) and the dual of 3.6 (a), it follows that $\mathrm{pd}_{\omega}(C) = \mathrm{id}_{\{C\}}(\omega) = \mathrm{id}_{\{C\}}(\omega^\wedge) = \mathrm{pd}_{\omega^\wedge}(C)$. To prove the last equality, we proceed by induction on $n := \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(C)$. To start with, we have $\mathrm{pd}_{\omega}(\mathcal{X}) = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega) = 0$. If $n = 0$ then $C \in \mathcal{X}$ and so $\mathrm{pd}_{\omega}(C) = 0 = \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(C)$.

Let $n = 1$. Then, we have a distinguished triangle $X_1 \to X_0 \to C \to X_1[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X_i \in \mathcal{X}$. By 4.4 (a), there is a distinguished triangle $Y_C \to X_C \xrightarrow{\varphi_C} C \to Y_C[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y_C \in \omega^\wedge$ and $X_C \in \mathcal{X}$. By the base change procedure, there exists a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & Y_C \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d] & Y_C \arrow[d] & \\
X_1 \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & E \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & X_C \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\varphi_C"'] & X_1[1] \arrow[d, equal] \\
X_1 \arrow[r] & X_0 \arrow[r, "\alpha"] \arrow[d] & C \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\beta"'] & X_1[1] \\
 & Y_C[1] \arrow[r, equal] & Y_C[1], &
\end{tikzcd}$$

where the rows and columns are distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$. Since $X_1, X_C \in \mathcal{X}$ it follows that $E \in \mathcal{X}$. On the other hand, since $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X, Y[1]) = 0$ for any $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $Y \in \omega^\wedge$ (see 4.2 (a)), we get that $\beta\alpha = 0$ and then the triangle $Y_C \to E \to X_0 \to Y_C[1]$ splits getting us that $Y_C \in \mathcal{X} \cap \omega^\wedge = \omega$ (see 4.2). On the other hand, using that $\mathrm{pd}_{\omega}(\mathcal{X}) = 0$ and 3.4 (a), we have that $\mathrm{pd}_{\omega}(C) \leq \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) = 1$. We assert that $\mathrm{pd}_{\omega}(C) > 0$. Indeed, suppose that $\mathrm{pd}_{\omega}(C) = 0$; and then $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(C, W[1]) = 0$ for any $W \in \omega$. Since $Y_C \in \omega$ we get that $\beta = 0$ and hence the triangle $Y_C \to X_C \to C \to Y_C[1]$ splits. Therefore $C \in \mathcal{X}$ contradicting that $\mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) = 1$; proving that $\mathrm{pd}_{\omega}(C) = 1 = \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(C)$.

Let $n \geq 2$. From 3.4 (a), we have that $\mathrm{pd}_{\omega}(C) \leq \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) = n$ since $\mathrm{pd}_{\omega}(\mathcal{X}) = 0$. Then, it is enough to prove that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(C[-n], -)|_{\omega} \neq 0$. Consider a distinguished triangle $K_1 \to X_0 \to C \to K_1[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(K_1) = n-1 = \mathrm{pd}_{\omega}(K_1)$. Applying the functor $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(-, W[n])$, with $W \in \omega$, to the triangle $C \to K_1[1] \to X_0[1] \to C[1]$ we get the exact sequence of abelian groups

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X_0[1], W[n]) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(K_1[1], W[n]) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(C, W[n]).$$

Suppose that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(C[-n], -)|_{\omega} = 0$. Then $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(K_1[1], W[n]) = 0$ since $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega) = 0$ and $n \geq 2$; contradicting that $\mathrm{pd}_{\omega}(K_1) = n-1$. □

Lemma 4.7. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ and $A \to B \to C \to A[1]$ a distinguished triangle in $\mathcal{T}$. Then*

(a) $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(B) \leq \max\{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(A), \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C)\}$;

(b) $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(A) \leq \max\{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(B), \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C)+1\}$;

(c) $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) \leq \max\{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(B), \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(A)-1\}$.

Proof. It is straightforward. □

Proposition 4.8. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ such that $\omega \subseteq {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}$. If ω is closed under direct summands and $\mathcal{X}$-injective, then*

$$\mathrm{id}_{\omega}(C) = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) = \mathrm{coresdim}_{\omega}(C), \quad \forall\, C \in {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U} \cap \omega^{\vee}.$$

Proof. Assume that ω is closed under direct summands and $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega) = 0$. Let $C \in {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U} \cap \omega^{\vee}$ and $n := \mathrm{coresdim}_{\omega}(C)$. By the dual of 3.4 (b), it follows

$$(*) \quad \alpha := \mathrm{id}_{\omega}(C) \leq \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) = \mathrm{coresdim}_{\omega}(C) = n.$$

Moreover, since $C \in \omega^{\vee}$ there is a distinguished triangle $(\eta)\ :\ C \to W_0 \to K_1 \to C[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $W_0 \in \omega$ and $\mathrm{coresdim}_{\omega}(K_1) = n-1$. Furthermore, from 2.2 (a) we get that $K_1 \in {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}$ since ${}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}$ is closed under cocones and $\omega \subseteq {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}$. Now, we prove the result by induction on α.

Let $\alpha = 0$. We assert that $C \in \omega$ (note that if this is true, then the result follows). We proceed by induction on n. If $n = 0$ it is clear that $C \in \omega$. So we may assume that $n > 0$, and then, applying 4.7 to (η) it follows that $\mathrm{id}_{\omega}(K_1) = 0$. Hence by induction we get that $K_1 \in \omega$, and so $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(K_1, C[1]) = 0$ since $\mathrm{id}_{\omega}(C) = 0$. Therefore the triangle (η) splits and then $C \in \omega$; proving the assertion.

Assume that $\alpha > 0$. Applying 4.7 to (η), we get that $\mathrm{id}_{\omega}(K_1) \leq \alpha - 1$. Thus, by induction, it follows that $\mathrm{id}_{\omega}(K_1) = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(K_1) = \mathrm{coresdim}_{\omega}(K_1) = n-1$. In particular, we obtain that $n-1 \leq \alpha - 1$ and hence by $(*)$ the result follows. □

Proposition 4.9. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ such that ω is closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$, $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under extensions and ω is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) ${}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1] \cap \mathcal{X}^{\wedge} = \omega^{\wedge}$.

(b) *If* $\mathcal{X}[-1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ *then* $\mathcal{U}_{\omega} = \omega^{\wedge} = \mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1] \cap \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$.

Proof. (a) Let $C \in {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1] \cap \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$. In particular, from 4.4 (a), there exists a distinguished triangle $Y_C \to X_C \to C \to Y_C[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y_C \in \omega^{\wedge}$ and $X_C \in \mathcal{X}$. We assert that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(X_C) = 0$. Indeed, it follows from 4.7 (a) since $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) = 0 = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(Y_C)$ (see 3.2 and 4.2 (a)). Therefore, $X_C \in \mathcal{X} \cap {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1]$ and by 4.2 (b), we get that $X_C \in \omega$ proving that $C \in \omega^{\wedge}$. On the other hand, since $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega^{\wedge}) = 0$, we have from 3.2 that $\omega^{\wedge} \subseteq {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1] \cap \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$.

(b) Assume that $\mathcal{X}[-1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. Hence, by 1.1 (b), we have that $\mathcal{X}$ is a cosuspended subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$. Therefore, from (a), it follows that $\omega^{\wedge} = \mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1] \cap \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$. Furthermore, since $\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1]$ is suspended and $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ is triangulated (see 2.10), we conclude that $\omega^{\wedge}$ is a suspended subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$; and so $\mathcal{U}_{\omega} \subseteq \omega^{\wedge}$. Finally, the equality $\mathcal{U}_{\omega} = \omega^{\wedge}$ follows from 2.5 (3). □

Theorem 4.10. *Let* $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ *be a pair of classes of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$ *which are closed under direct summands,* $\mathcal{X}$ *be cosuspended and* ω *be an* $\mathcal{X}$*-injective weak-cogenerator in* $\mathcal{X}$. *Then,*

$$\varepsilon_n^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{X}[n] = \mathcal{X}^{\wedge} \cap {}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\omega}[n+1] = \mathcal{X}^{\wedge} \cap {}^{\perp}(\omega^{\wedge})[n+1], \quad \forall n \geq 0.$$

Proof. From 2.10, we have that $\varepsilon_n^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{X}[n]$ and $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge} = \cup_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{X}[n]$. On the other hand, by 3.2 and 4.6, it follows that

$$\mathcal{X}^{\wedge} \cap {}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\omega^{\wedge}}[n+1] = \mathcal{X}^{\wedge} \cap {}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\omega}[n+1] = \mathcal{X}[n] \cap \mathcal{X}^{\wedge} = \mathcal{X}[n].$$

Finally, since $\omega^{\wedge}$ is a suspended subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ (see 4.9 (b)), we have that ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\omega^{\wedge}} = {}^{\perp}(\omega^{\wedge})$; proving the result. □

Definition 4.11. *For a given class* $\mathcal{Y}$ *of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$, *we set* $\mathcal{Y}^{\sim} := (\mathcal{Y}^{\wedge})^{\vee}$.

Lemma 4.12. *Let* $\mathcal{X}$ *be a class of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$. *Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) *If* $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ *is closed under cocones then* $\omega^{\sim} \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ *for any* $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{X}$.

(b) $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ *is closed under cocones if and only if* $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge} = \mathcal{X}^{\sim}$.

(c) *If* $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge} = \mathcal{X}^{\sim}$ *then* $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}[-1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$.

Proof. (a) Let $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ and assume that $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ is closed under cocones. Hence $\omega^{\wedge} \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ and so by 2.5 (2), we conclude that $\omega^{\sim} \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$.

(b) Assume that $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ is closed under cocones. It is clear that $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge} \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{\sim}$. On the other hand, by (a) it follows that $\mathcal{X}^{\sim} \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$.

Suppose that $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge} = \mathcal{X}^{\sim}$. Let $A \to B \to C \to A[1]$ be a distinguished triangle in $\mathcal{T}$ with B, C in $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$. Then $A \in \mathcal{X}^{\sim} = \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ and so $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ is closed under cocones.

(c) Let $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge} = \mathcal{X}^{\sim}$ and consider $X \in \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$. Since, we have the distinguished triangle $X[-1] \to 0 \to X \overset{1_X}{\to} X$ and $0, X \in \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$, it follows from (b) that $X[-1] \in \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$; proving the lemma. □

Corollary 4.13. *Let $(\mathcal{X},\omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. If $\mathcal{X}$ is cosuspended and $\omega\subseteq\mathcal{X}$, then $\omega^{\sim}\subseteq\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}=\mathcal{X}^{\sim}$.*

Proof. It follows from 4.12 and the fact that $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ is triangulated (see 2.10). $\square$

In case ω is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator in a cosuspended subcategory $\mathcal{X}$ of $\mathcal{T}$, both closed under direct summands, the thick subcategory $\mathcal{L}_\omega$ can be characterized as follows.

Theorem 4.14. *Let $(\mathcal{X},\omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, $\mathcal{X}$ be cosuspended and ω be closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$. If ω is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$, the following statements hold.*

(a) $\omega^{\sim}=\{C\in\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}:\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C)<\infty\}=\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}\cap(\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1])^{\vee}$.

(b) *$\omega^{\sim}$ is the smallest triangulated subcategory of $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ containing ω.*

(c) *If $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$, then*

$$\mathcal{L}_\omega=\omega^{\sim}=\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{X}}\cap(\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1])^{\vee}.$$

Proof. Assume that $\omega\subseteq\mathcal{X}\subseteq\mathcal{X}[-1]*\omega$ and $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega)=0$. Let $\mathcal{Y}:=\{C\in\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}:\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C)<\infty\}$. We start by proving that $\omega^{\sim}\subseteq\mathcal{Y}$. By 4.13, we know that $\omega^{\sim}\subseteq\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$. On the other hand, since $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega^{\wedge})=0$ (see 4.2(a)), we can apply the dual of 3.4(a), and then $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C)\leq\mathrm{coresdim}_{\omega^{\wedge}}(C)<\infty$ for any $C\in\omega^{\sim}$; proving that $\omega^{\sim}\subseteq\mathcal{Y}$.
Let $C\in\mathcal{Y}$. By 4.4 (a), there is a distinguished triangle $C\to Y^C\to X^C\to C[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y^C\in\omega^{\wedge}$ and $X^C\in\mathcal{X}$. Hence, from 4.7 (b) we get that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(X^C)<\infty$ and then, by 4.3 $X^C\in\omega^{\vee}\subseteq\omega^{\sim}$; proving that $C\in\omega^{\sim}$. Hence $\mathcal{Y}\subseteq\omega^{\sim}$. In order to get the second equality in (a), we use 3.2 and the fact that $\mathcal{X}={}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}$ to obtain

$$\{C\in\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}:\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C)<\infty\}=\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}\cap(\cup_{n\geq 0}\,\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-n-1]).$$

On the other hand, since $\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1]$ is suspended, then by the dual of 2.10, it follows that $(\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1])^{\vee}=\cup_{n\geq 0}\,\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-n-1]$ and also that $(\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1])^{\vee}$ is a thick subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$. In particular, by 2.10, we get (b). Finally, (c) follows from (a) and 2.10. $\square$

Proposition 4.15. *Let $(\mathcal{X},\omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, $\mathcal{X}$ cosuspended and ω closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$. If ω is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$, then*

(a) $\mathrm{id}_\omega(C)=\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C),\quad\forall C\in\omega^{\sim}$;

(b) $\omega^{\sim}\cap{}_\omega\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-n-1]=\omega^{\sim}\cap\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-n-1],\quad\forall n\geq 0$.

Proof. (a) By 2.10 and 4.14, we know that $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ and $\omega^{\sim}$ are triangulated subcategories of $\mathcal{T}$. Furthermore, from 4.13 it follows that $\omega^{\sim}\subseteq\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$. Let $C\in\omega^{\sim}$. It is enough to prove that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C)\leq\mathrm{id}_\omega(C)$. In order to do that, we will use induction on $n:=\mathrm{id}_\omega(C)$.

Since $C \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge$, we have from 4.4 the existence of a distinguished triangle $(\eta)\ :\ C \to Y^C \to X^C \to C[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y^C \in \omega^\wedge \subseteq \omega^\sim$ and $X^C \in \mathcal{X}$. We assert that $X^C \in \mathcal{X} \cap \omega^\vee$. Indeed, using that $\omega^\sim$ is triangulated we conclude that $X^C \in \mathcal{X} \cap \omega^\sim$ and hence $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(X^C)$ is finite (see 4.14 (a)). Thus $X^C \in \mathcal{X} \cap \omega^\vee$ by 4.3; proving the assertion.

Let $n = 0$. Then $\mathrm{id}_\omega(X^C) = 0$ since $\mathrm{id}_\omega(Y^C) = 0$ (see 4.2 and 4.7). On the other hand, 4.8 gives the equalities $\mathrm{coresdim}_\omega(X^C) = \mathrm{id}_\omega(X^C) = 0$. Hence $X^C \in \omega$ and since $\mathrm{id}_\omega(C) = 0$, it follows that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X^C, C[1]) = 0$. Therefore, the triangle (η) splits giving us that C is a direct summand of Y^C, and hence $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) \leq \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(Y^C) \leq \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega^\wedge) = 0$.

Assume that $n > 0$. Since $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(Y^C) = 0 = \mathrm{id}_\omega(Y^C)$, it follows from 4.7 that $\mathrm{id}_\omega(X^C) \leq n-1$. Hence, by induction $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(X^C) \leq \mathrm{id}_\omega(X^C) \leq n-1$. Therefore, applying again 4.7 to the triangle (η), we get that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) \leq n = \mathrm{id}_\omega(C)$; proving the result.

(b) By 3.2, the item (a) and the fact that ${}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{X}$ the result follows. $\square$

REFERENCES

[1] L. Angeleri Hügel, O. Mendoza. Homological dimensions in cotorsion pairs. *Illinois J. Math.* 53, no1 (2009), 251-263.

[2] M. Auslander, R.O. Buchweitz. The Homological theory of maximal Cohen-Macaulay approximations. *Societe Mathematique de France* 38 (1989), 5-37.

[3] M. Auslander, I. Reiten. Applications of contravariantly finite subcategories. *Advances in Math.* 86 (1991), 111-152.

[4] M. Auslander, S. O. Smalo. Preprojective modules over artin algebra. *J. Algebra* 66 (1980), 61-122.

[5] A. A. Beilinson, J. Bernstein, P. Deligne. Faisceaux pervers. *Asterisque* 100 (1982).

[6] M. V. Bondarko. Weight structures for triangulated categories: weight filtrations, weight spectral sequences and weight complexes, applications to motives and to the stable homotopy category. Preprint available at http://arxiv.org/abs/0704.4003v1

[7] A. B. Buan. Subcategories of the derived category and cotilting complexes. *Colloq. Math.* 88 (2001), no. 1, 1-11.

[8] A. Beligiannis, I. Reiten. Homological and homotopical aspects of torsion theories. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* 188 (2007) no. 883.

[9] E. Enochs. Injective and flat covers, envelopes and resolvents. *Israel J. Math.* 39 (1981), 189-209.

[10] M. Hashimoto. Auslander-Buchweitz approximations of equivariant modules. *LMS, Lecture Notes Series* 282 (2000) Cambridge University Press.

[11] O. Mendoza, C. Sáenz. Tilting categories with applications to stratifying systems. *Journal of Algebra,* 302 (2006) 419-449.

[12] O. Mendoza, C. Sáenz, V. Santiago, M. J. Souto Salorio. Auslander-Buchwetiz context and co-t-structures. *Preprint* 2010.

[13] D. Pauksztello. Compact corigid objects in triangulated categories and co-t-structures. *Cent. Eur. J. Math.* 6 (2008), no. 1, 25-42.

Octavio Mendoza Hernández:
Instituto de Matemáticas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
Circuito Exterior, Ciudad Universitaria, C.P. 04510, México, D.F. MEXICO.
`omendoza@matem.unam.mx`

Edith Corina Sáenz Valadez:
Departamento de Matemáticas, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
Circuito Exterior, Ciudad Universitaria, C.P. 04510, México, D.F. MEXICO.
`ecsv@lya.fciencias.unam.mx`

Valente Santiago Vargas:
Instituto de Matemáticas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
Circuito Exterior, Ciudad Universitaria, C.P. 04510, México, D.F. MEXICO.
`valente@matem.unam.mx`

María José Souto Salorio:
Facultade de Informática, Universidade da Coruña
15071 A Coruña, ESPAÑA.
`mariaj@udc.es`

arXiv:1002.3926v4 [math.CT] 9 Oct 2011

AUSLANDER-BUCHWEITZ APPROXIMATION THEORY FOR TRIANGULATED CATEGORIES

O. MENDOZA, E. C. SÁENZ, V. SANTIAGO, M. J. SOUTO SALORIO.

Abstract. We introduce and develop an analogous of the Auslander-Buchweitz approximation theory (see [2]) in the context of triangulated categories, by using a version of relative homology in this setting. We also prove several results concerning relative homological algebra in a triangulated category $\mathcal{T}$, which are based on the behavior of certain subcategories under finiteness of resolutions and vanishing of Hom-spaces. For example: we establish the existence of preenvelopes (and precovers) in certain triangulated subcategories of $\mathcal{T}$. The results resemble various constructions and results of Auslander and Buchweitz, and are concentrated in exploring the structure of a triangulated category $\mathcal{T}$ equipped with a pair $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$, where $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under extensions and ω is a weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$, usually under additional conditions. This reduces, among other things, to the existence of distinguished triangles enjoying special properties, and the behavior of (suitably defined) (co)resolutions, projective or injective dimension of objects of $\mathcal{T}$ and the formation of orthogonal subcategories.

Introduction.

The approximation theory has its origin with the concept of injective envelopes and it has had a wide development in the context of module categories since the fifties.

In independent papers, Auslander, Reiten and Smalo (for the category $\mathrm{mod}\,(\Lambda)$ of finitely generated modules over an artin algebra Λ), and Enochs (for the category $\mathrm{Mod}\,(R)$ of modules over an arbitrary ring R) introduced a general approximation theory involving precovers and preenvelopes (see [3], [4] and [9]).

Auslander and Buchweitz (see [2]) studied the ideas of injective envelopes and projective covers in terms of maximal Cohen-Macaulay approximations for certain modules. In their work, they also studied the relationship between the relative injective dimension and the coresolution dimension of a module. They developed their theory in the context of abelian categories providing important applications in several settings.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 18E30 and 18G20. Secondary 18G25.

The authors thank the financial support received from Project PAPIIT-UNAM IN101607.

Based on [2], Hashimoto defined the so called "Auslander-Buchweitz context" for abelian categories, giving a new framework to homological approximation theory (see [10]).

Recently, triangulated categories entered into the subject in a relevant way and several authors have studied the concept of approximation in both contexts, abelian and triangulated categories (see, for example, [1] [7], [8] and [11]).

In this paper, we develop a relative homological theory for triangulated categories, we do so, similarly as it was done by Auslander and Buchweitz for abelian categories in [2]. Along this work, we denote by $\mathcal{T}$ an arbitrary triangulated category (no necessarily closed under arbitrary coproducts) and by $\mathcal{X}$ a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$.

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 1, we give some basic notions and properties of the theory of triangulated categories, that will be used in the rest of the work.

In Section 2, we study the notion of $\mathcal{X}$-resolution dimension which allows us to characterize the triangulated subcategory $\Delta_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X})$ of $\mathcal{T}$, generated by a cosuspended subcategory $\mathcal{X}$ of $\mathcal{T}$ (Theorem 2.5).

In Section 3, the properties of the $\mathcal{X}$-projective (respectively, $\mathcal{X}$-injective) dimension and its relation to the $\mathcal{X}$-resolution dimension (respectively, coresolution) are established. The main result of this section is the Theorem 3.4 that relates different kinds of relative homological dimensions by using suitable subcategories of $\mathcal{T}$.

In Section 4, we focus our attention to the notions of $\mathcal{X}$-injectives and weak-cogenerators in $\mathcal{X}$. We relate these ideas to the concepts of injective and coresolution dimension. This leads us to characterize several triangulated subcategories; and moreover, in the Theorem 4.4 we establish the existence of $\mathcal{X}$-precovers and $\omega^{\wedge}$-preenvelopes. Finally, in the Theorem 4.14, for a given pair $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ satisfying certain conditions, we give several characterizations of the triangulated subcategory $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}}(\omega)$ of $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ generated by ω.

In a forthcoming paper (see [12]), a connection between Auslander-Buchweitz approximation theory in triangulated categories and co-t-structures (see [6] and [13]) is established.

1. Preliminaries

Throughout this paper, $\mathcal{T}$ will be a triangulated category and $\Sigma : \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{T}$ its suspension functor. For the sake of tradition, we set $X[n] := \Sigma^n X$ for any integer n and any object $X \in \mathcal{T}$. The term subcategory, in this paper, means: full, additive and closed under isomorphisms subcategory.

An important tool, which is a consequence of the octahedral axiom in $\mathcal{T}$, is the so-called co-base change. That is, for any diagram in $\mathcal{T}$

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & Y \\
Z &
\end{tikzcd}$$

there exists a commutative and exact diagram in $\mathcal{T}$

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & W[-1] \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d] & W[-1] \arrow[d] & \\
U[-1] \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & X \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & Y \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & U \arrow[d, equal] \\
U[-1] \arrow[r] & Z \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & E \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & U \\
 & W \arrow[r, equal] & W &
\end{tikzcd}$$

where exact means that the rows and columns, in the preceding diagram, are distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$. The base change, which is the dual notion of co-base change, also holds.

Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. We put ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{X} := \{Z \in \mathcal{T} : \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(Z,-)|_{\mathcal{X}} = 0\}$ and $\mathcal{X}^{\perp} := \{Z \in \mathcal{T} : \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(-,Z)|_{\mathcal{X}} = 0\}$. We denote by $\mathcal{X} * \mathcal{Y}$ the class of objects $Z \in \mathcal{T}$ for which exists a distinguished triangle $X \to Z \to Y \to X[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$. It is also well known that the operation $*$ is associative (see [5, 1.3.10]). Furthermore, it is said that $\mathcal{X}$ is **closed under extensions** if $\mathcal{X} * \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$.

Recall that a class $\mathcal{X}$ of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ is said to be **suspended** (respectively, **cosuspended**) if $\mathcal{X}[1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ (respectively, $\mathcal{X}[-1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}$) and $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under extensions. By the following lemma, it is easy to see, that a suspended (respectively, cosuspended) class $\mathcal{X}$ of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, can be considered as a subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$.

Lemma 1.1. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$.*

(a) *If $0 \in \mathcal{X}$ then $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \mathcal{Y}$ for any class $\mathcal{Y}$ of objects in $\mathcal{T}$.*
(b) *If $\mathcal{X}$ is either suspended or cosuspended, then $0 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X} * \mathcal{X}$.*

Proof. (a) If $0 \in \mathcal{X}$ then we get $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \mathcal{Y}$ by using the distinguished triangle $0 \to Y \xrightarrow{1_Y} Y \to 0$ for any $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$.

(b) Let $\mathcal{X}$ be cosuspended (the other case, is analogous). Then, it follows that $0 \in \mathcal{X}$ since we have the distinguished triangle $X[-1] \to 0 \to X \to X$ for any $X \in \mathcal{X}$. Hence (b) follows from (a). $\square$

Given a class $\mathcal{X}$ of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, it is said that $\mathcal{X}$ is **closed under cones** if for any distinguished triangle $A \to B \to C \to A[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $A, B \in \mathcal{X}$ we have that $C \in \mathcal{X}$. Similarly, $\mathcal{X}$ is **closed under cocones** if for any distinguished triangle $A \to B \to C \to A[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $B, C \in \mathcal{X}$ we have that $A \in \mathcal{X}$.

We denote by $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ (respectively, ${}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}$) the smallest suspended (respectively, cosuspended) subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ containing the class $\mathcal{X}$. Note that if $\mathcal{X}$ is suspended (respectively, cosuspended) subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$, then $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ (respectively, $\mathcal{X} = {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}$). We also recall that a subcategory $\mathcal{U}$ of $\mathcal{T}$, which is suspended and cosuspended, is called **triangulated subcategory** of $\mathcal{T}$. A **thick** subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ is a triangulated subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ which is closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$. We also denote by $\Delta_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X})$ (respectively, $\overline{\Delta}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X})$) to the smallest triangulated (respectively, smallest thick) subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ containing the class $\mathcal{X}$. Observe that $\Delta_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \overline{\Delta}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X})$. For the following definition, see [3], [7], [8] and [9].

Definition 1.2. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be classes of objects in the triangulated category $\mathcal{T}$. A morphism $f : X \to C$ in $\mathcal{T}$ is said to be an* $\mathcal{X}$**-precover** *of C if $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X', f) : \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X', X) \to \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X', C)$ is surjective $\forall X' \in \mathcal{X}$. If any $C \in \mathcal{Y}$ admits an $\mathcal{X}$-precover, then $\mathcal{X}$ is called a* **precovering class** *in $\mathcal{Y}$. By dualizing the definition above, we get the notion of an* $\mathcal{X}$**-preenveloping** *of C and a* **preenveloping class** *in $\mathcal{Y}$.*

Finally, in order to deal with the (co)resolution, relative projective and relative injective dimensions, we consider the extended natural numbers $\overline{\mathbb{N}} := \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$. Here we set the following rules: (a) $x + \infty = \infty$ for any $x \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}$, (b) $x < \infty$ for any $x \in \mathbb{N}$ and (c) $\min(\emptyset) := \infty$.

2. RESOLUTION AND CORESOLUTION DIMENSIONS

Now, we define certain classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ which will lead us to the notions of resolution and coresolution dimensions.

Definition 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. For any natural number n, we introduce inductively the class $\varepsilon_n^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})$ as follows: $\varepsilon_0^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X}) := \mathcal{X}$ and assuming defined $\varepsilon_{n-1}^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})$, the class $\varepsilon_n^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})$ is given by all the objects $Z \in \mathcal{T}$ for which exists a distinguished triangle in $\mathcal{T}$*

$$Z[-1] \longrightarrow W \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow Z$$

with $W \in \varepsilon_{n-1}^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})$ and $X \in \mathcal{X}$.

Dually, we set $\varepsilon_0^{\vee}(\mathcal{X}) := \mathcal{X}$ *and supposing defined* $\varepsilon_{n-1}^{\vee}(\mathcal{X})$, *the class* $\varepsilon_n^{\vee}(\mathcal{X})$ *is formed for all the objects* $Z \in \mathcal{T}$ *for which exists a distinguished triangle in* $\mathcal{T}$

$$Z \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow K \longrightarrow Z[1]$$

with $K \in \varepsilon_{n-1}^{\vee}(\mathcal{X})$ *and* $X \in \mathcal{X}$.

We have the following properties for $\varepsilon_n^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})$ (and the similar ones for $\varepsilon_n^{\vee}(\mathcal{X})$).

Proposition 2.2. *Let* $\mathcal{T}$ *be a triangulated category,* $\mathcal{X}$ *be a class of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$, *and* n *a natural number. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) *For any* $Z \in \mathcal{T}$ *and* $n > 0$, *we have that* $Z \in \varepsilon_n^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})$ *if and only if there is a family* $\{K_j[-1] \to K_{j+1} \to X_j \to K_j, \quad 0 \leq j \leq n-1\}$ *of distinguished triangles in* $\mathcal{T}$ *with* $K_0 = Z$, $X_j \in \mathcal{X}$ *and* $K_n \in \mathcal{X}$.

(b) $\varepsilon_n^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X}) = *_{i=0}^{n} \mathcal{X}[i] := \mathcal{X} * \mathcal{X}[1] * \cdots * \mathcal{X}[n]$.

(c) $\varepsilon_n^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \varepsilon_{n+2}^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})$ *and* $0 \in \varepsilon_1^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})$.

(d) *If* $0 \in \mathcal{X}$ *then* $\mathcal{X}[n] \subseteq \varepsilon_n^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})$ *and* $\varepsilon_n^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})[1] \subseteq \varepsilon_{n+1}^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})$.

Proof. (a) If $n = 1$ then the equivalence follows from the definition of $\varepsilon_1^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})$. Let $n \geq 2$ and suppose (by induction) that the equivalence is true for $\varepsilon_{n-1}^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})$. By definition, $Z \in \varepsilon_n^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})$ if and only if there is a distinguished triangle in $\mathcal{T}$

$$Z[-1] \longrightarrow K_1 \longrightarrow X_0 \longrightarrow Z$$

with $K_1 \in \varepsilon_{n-1}^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})$ and $X_0 \in \mathcal{X}$. On the other hand, by induction, we have that $K_1 \in \varepsilon_{n-1}^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})$ if and only if there is a family $\{K_j[-1] \to K_{j+1} \to X_j \to K_j, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n-1\}$ of distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X_j \in \mathcal{X}$ and $K_n \in \mathcal{X}$; proving (a).

(b) By definition, we have that $\varepsilon_n^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{X} * \varepsilon_{n-1}^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})[1]$. So, by induction, it follows that $\varepsilon_n^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{X} * (*_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{X}[i])[1] = *_{i=0}^{n} \mathcal{X}[i]$.

(c) Let $X \in \mathcal{X}$. Since $0 \to X \xrightarrow{1_X} X \to 0$ is a distinguished triangle in $\mathcal{T}$, it follows that $0 \in \varepsilon_1^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})$. On the other hand, using the distinguished triangle $X[-1] \to 0 \to X \xrightarrow{1_X} X$ in $\mathcal{T}$ and since $0 \in \varepsilon_1^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})$, it follows that $\varepsilon_0^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \varepsilon_2^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})$. Let $Z \in \varepsilon_n^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})$. Consider the distinguished triangle $Z[-1] \to K \to X \to Z$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $K \in \varepsilon_{n-1}^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})$. By induction $\varepsilon_{n-1}^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \varepsilon_{n+1}^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})$ and so $Z \in \varepsilon_{n+2}^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})$; proving (c).

(d) Assume that $0 \in \mathcal{X}$. For the first inclusion, we use (b) to get the equality $\varepsilon_n^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X}) = \varepsilon_{n-1}^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X}) * \mathcal{X}[n]$, and so, the inclusion follows from 1.1 (a) since $0 \in \varepsilon_{n-1}^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})$.
For the second inclusion, let $Z \in \varepsilon_n^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})$. Using the distinguished triangle $Z \xrightarrow{1_Z} Z \to 0 \to Z[1]$, we get that $Z[1] \in \varepsilon_{n+1}^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})$. □

Following [2] and [7], we introduce the notion of $\mathcal{X}$-resolution (respectively, coresolution) dimension of any class $\mathcal{Y}$ of objects of $\mathcal{T}$.

Definition 2.3. *Let* $\mathcal{X}$ *be a class of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$.

(a) $\mathcal{X}^\wedge := \cup_{n\geq 0}\, \varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$ *and* $\mathcal{X}^\vee := \cup_{n\geq 0}\, \varepsilon_n^\vee(\mathcal{X})$.

(b) *For any* $M \in \mathcal{T}$, *the* $\mathcal{X}$-**resolution dimension** *of* M *is*

$$\mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) := \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \;:\; M \in \varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X})\}.$$

Dually, the $\mathcal{X}$-**coresolution dimension** *of* M *is*

$$\mathrm{coresdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) := \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} :\; M \in \varepsilon_n^\vee(\mathcal{X})\}.$$

(c) *For any subclass* $\mathcal{Y}$ *of* $\mathcal{T}$, *we set* $\mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) := \max\{\mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) : M \in \mathcal{Y}\}$. *Similarly, we also have* $\mathrm{coresdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y})$.

Corollary 2.4. *Let* $\mathcal{X}$ *and* $\mathcal{Y}$ *be classes of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$. *Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) $\mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X}) \leq n < \infty$ *if and only if* $\mathcal{X} \subseteq *_{i=0}^{n}\, \mathcal{Y}[i]$.

(b) *If* $\mathcal{X}$ *is closed under extensions, then* $\mathcal{X} * \mathcal{X}^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge$.

Proof. It follows by definition and 2.2 (b). □

The following result will be useful in this paper. The item (a) already appeared in [7]. We also recall that $\Delta_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X})$ (respectively, $\overline{\Delta}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X})$) stands for the smallest triangulated (respectively, smallest thick) subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ containing the class of objects $\mathcal{X}$.

Theorem 2.5. *For any cosuspended subcategory* $\mathcal{X}$ *of* $\mathcal{T}$ *and any object* $C \in \mathcal{T}$, *the following statements hold.*

(a) $\mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) \leq n$ *if and only if* $C \in \mathcal{X}[n]$.

(b) $\mathcal{X}^\wedge = \cup_{n\geq 0}\, \mathcal{X}[n] = \Delta_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X})$.

(c) *If* $\mathcal{X}$ *is closed under direct summands in* $\mathcal{T}$, *then* $\mathcal{X}^\wedge = \overline{\Delta}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X})$.

Proof. (a) By 2.2 (b), it is enough to prove that $*_{i=0}^{n}\, \mathcal{X}[i] = \mathcal{X}[n]$. Indeed, since $0 \in \mathcal{X}$ (see 1.1 (b)), it follows from 2.2 that $\mathcal{X}[n] \subseteq *_{i=0}^{n}\, \mathcal{X}[i]$. On the other hand, using that $\mathcal{X} * \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{X}[-1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, it follows that

$$*_{i=0}^{n}\, \mathcal{X}[i] = (*_{i=0}^{n}\, \mathcal{X}[i-n])[n] \subseteq (*_{i=0}^{n}\, \mathcal{X})[n] \subseteq \mathcal{X}[n].$$

(b) From (a), we get $\mathcal{X}^\wedge = \cup_{n\geq 0}\, \mathcal{X}[n]$ and hence $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ is closed under positive and negative shifts. We prove now that $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ is closed under extensions. Indeed, let $X[n] \to Y \to X'[m] \to X[n][1]$ be a distinguished triangle in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X, X' \in \mathcal{X}$. We may assume that $n \leq m$ and then $X[n] = X[n-m][m] \in \mathcal{X}[m]$ since $n-m \leq 0$ and $\mathcal{X}[-1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. Using now that $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under extensions, it follows that $Y \in \mathcal{X}[m] \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge$; proving that $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ is closed under extensions. Hence $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ is a triangulated subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ and moreover it is the smallest one containing $\mathcal{X}$ since $\mathcal{X}^\wedge = \cup_{n\geq 0}\, \mathcal{X}[n]$.

(c) It follows from (b). □

Remark 2.6. (1) *Observe that a suspended class* $\mathcal{U}$ *of* $\mathcal{T}$ *is closed under cones. Indeed, if* $A \to B \to C \to A[1]$ *is a distinguished triangle in* $\mathcal{T}$ *with* $A, B \in \mathcal{U}$ *then* $A[1], B \in \mathcal{U}$; *and so we get* $C \in \mathcal{U}$. *Similarly, if* $\mathcal{U}$ *is cosuspended then it is closed under cocones.*

(2) *Let* $(\mathcal{Y},\omega)$ *be a pair of classes of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$ *with* $\omega\subseteq\mathcal{Y}$. *If* $\mathcal{Y}$ *is closed under cones (respectively, cocones) then* $\omega^\wedge\subseteq\mathcal{Y}$ *(respectively,* $\omega^\vee\subseteq\mathcal{Y}$*). Indeed, assume that* $\mathcal{Y}$ *is closed under cones and let* $M\in\omega^\wedge$. *Thus* $M\in\varepsilon_n^\wedge(\omega)$ *for some* $n\in\mathbb{N}$. *If* $n=0$ *then* $M\in\omega\subseteq\mathcal{Y}$. *Let* $n>0$, *and hence there is a distinguished triangle* $M[-1]\to K\to Y\to M$ *in* $\mathcal{T}$ *with* $K\in\varepsilon_{n-1}^\wedge(\omega)$ *and* $Y\in\mathcal{Y}$. *By induction* $K\in\mathcal{Y}$ *and hence* $M\in\mathcal{Y}$ *since* $\mathcal{Y}$ *is closed under cones; proving that* $\omega^\wedge\subseteq\mathcal{Y}$.

(3) *Note that* $\mathcal{X}^\wedge\subseteq\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}$ *(respectively,* $\mathcal{X}^\vee\subseteq{}_\mathcal{X}\mathcal{U}$*) since* $\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}$ *(respectively,* ${}_\mathcal{X}\mathcal{U}$*) is closed under cones (respectively, cocones) and contains* $\mathcal{X}$.

Using the fact that the functor Hom is a cohomological one, we get the following description of the orthogonal categories. In particular, observe that ${}_\mathcal{X}\mathcal{U}^\perp$ (respectively, ${}^\perp\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}$) is a suspended (respectively, cosuspended) subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$.

Lemma 2.7. *For any class* $\mathcal{X}$ *of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$, *we have that*

(a) ${}^\perp\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}=\{Z\in\mathcal{T}\ :\ \mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(Z,X[i])=0,\quad\forall i\geq 0,\forall X\in\mathcal{X}\}$,

(b) ${}_\mathcal{X}\mathcal{U}^\perp=\{Z\in\mathcal{T}\ :\ \mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(X[i],Z)=0,\quad\forall i\leq 0,\forall X\in\mathcal{X}\}$.

Proof. It is straightforward. □

Lemma 2.8. *Let* $\mathcal{Y}$ *and* $\mathcal{X}$ *be classes of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$, $n\geq 1$ *and* $Z\in\mathcal{T}$. *The following statements hold.*

(a) *The object* Z *belongs to* $\mathcal{Y}*\mathcal{Y}[1]*\cdots*\mathcal{Y}[n-1]*\mathcal{X}[n]$ *if and only if there exists a family* $\{K_i\to Y_i\to K_{i+1}\to K_i[1]\ :\ Y_i\in\mathcal{Y},\ 0\leq i\leq n-1\}$ *of distinguished triangles in* $\mathcal{T}$ *with* $K_0\in\mathcal{X}$ *and* $Z=K_n$.

(b) *The object* Z *belongs to* $\mathcal{X}[-n]*\mathcal{Y}[-n+1]*\cdots*\mathcal{Y}[-1]*\mathcal{Y}$ *if and only if there exists a family* $\{K_{i+1}\to Y_i\to K_i\to K_{i+1}[1]\ :\ Y_i\in\mathcal{Y},\ 0\leq i\leq n-1\}$ *of distinguished triangles in* $\mathcal{T}$ *with* $K_0\in\mathcal{X}$ *and* $Z=K_n$.

Proof. (a) We proceed by induction on n. If $n=1$ then (a) is trivial. Suppose that $n\geq 2$ and consider the class

$$\mathcal{Z}_{n-1}:=\mathcal{Y}*\mathcal{Y}[1]*\cdots*\mathcal{Y}[n-2]*\mathcal{X}[n-1].$$

It is clear that $\mathcal{Y}*\mathcal{Y}[1]*\cdots*\mathcal{Y}[n-1]*\mathcal{X}[n]=\mathcal{Y}*\mathcal{Z}_{n-1}[1]$; and then, we have that $Z\in\mathcal{Y}*\mathcal{Y}[1]*\cdots*\mathcal{Y}[n-1]*\mathcal{X}[n]$ if and only if there is a distinguished triangle

$$K\longrightarrow Y\longrightarrow Z\longrightarrow K[1]$$

in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y\in\mathcal{Y}$ and $K\in\mathcal{Z}_{n-1}$. On the other hand, by induction, we have that $K\in\mathcal{Z}_{n-1}$ if and only if there is a family $\{K_i\to Y_i\to K_{i+1}\to K_i[1]\ :\ Y_i\in\mathcal{Y},\ 0\leq i\leq n-2\}$ of distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$ with $K_0\in\mathcal{X}$ and $K=K_{n-1}$. So the result follows by adding the triangle above to the preceding family of triangles.

(b) It is similar to (a). □

Corollary 2.9. *Let* $\mathcal{Y}$ *be a class of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$, $n \geq 1$ *and* $Z, K \in \mathcal{T}$. *The object* Z *belongs to* $\mathcal{Y} * \mathcal{Y}[1] * \cdots * \mathcal{Y}[n-1] * K[n]$ *if and only if* K *belongs to* $Z[-n] * \mathcal{Y}[-n+1] * \cdots * \mathcal{Y}[-1] * \mathcal{Y}$.

Proof. It follows from 2.8 by taking $\mathcal{X} = \{K\}$ in (a) and $\mathcal{X} = \{Z\}$ in (b). $\square$

3. RELATIVE HOMOLOGICAL DIMENSIONS

In this section, we introduce the $\mathcal{X}$-projective (respectively, injective) dimension of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. Moreover, we establish a result that relates this relative projective dimension with the resolution dimension as can be seen in the Theorem 3.4.

Definition 3.1. *Let* $\mathcal{X}$ *be a class of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$ *and* M *an object in* $\mathcal{T}$.

(a) *The* **$\mathcal{X}$-projective dimension** *of* M *is*

$$\operatorname{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) := \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \,:\, \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(M[-i], -)\,|_{\mathcal{X}} = 0, \quad \forall i > n\}.$$

(b) *The* **$\mathcal{X}$-injective dimension** *of* M *is*

$$\operatorname{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) := \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \,:\, \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(-, M[i])\,|_{\mathcal{X}} = 0, \quad \forall i > n\}.$$

(c) *For any class* $\mathcal{Y}$ *of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$, *we set*

$$\operatorname{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) := \max\{\operatorname{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) \,:\, C \in \mathcal{Y}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) := \max\{\operatorname{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) \,:\, C \in \mathcal{Y}\}.$$

Lemma 3.2. *Let* $\mathcal{X}$ *be a class of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$. *Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) *For any* $M \in \mathcal{T}$ *and* $n \in \mathbb{N}$, *we have that*
  (a1) $\operatorname{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) \leq n$ *if and only if* $M \in {}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}[n+1]$;
  (a2) $\operatorname{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) \leq n$ *if and only if* $M \in {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-n-1]$.

(b) $\operatorname{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X}) = \operatorname{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y})$ *for any class* $\mathcal{Y}$ *of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$.

Proof. (a) follows from 2.7, and (b) is straightforward. $\square$

Proposition 3.3. *Let* $\mathcal{X}$ *be a class of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$ *and* $M \in \mathcal{T}$. *Then*

$$\operatorname{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) = \operatorname{resdim}_{{}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}[1]}(M) \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) = \operatorname{coresdim}_{{}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1]}(M).$$

Proof. Since ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is cosuspended (see 2.7 (a)), the first equality follows from 3.2 (a1) and 2.5 (a). The second equality can be proven similarly. $\square$

Now, we prove the following relationship between the relative projective dimension and the resolution dimension.

Theorem 3.4. *Let* $\mathcal{X}$ *and* $\mathcal{Y}$ *be classes of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$. *Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) $\operatorname{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) \leq \operatorname{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) + \operatorname{resdim}_{\mathcal{Y}}(L), \quad \forall L \in \mathcal{T}$.

(b) *If* $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}} \cap {}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}[1]$ *and* $\mathcal{Y}$ *is closed under direct summands in* $\mathcal{T}$*, then*

$$\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) = \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{Y}}(L), \quad \forall L \in \mathcal{Y}^{\wedge}.$$

Proof. (a) Let $d := \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{Y}}(L)$ and $\alpha := \mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y})$. We may assume that d and α are finite. We prove (a) by induction on d. If $d = 0$, it follows that $L \in \mathcal{Y}$ and then (a) holds in this case.
Assume that $d \geq 1$. So we have a distinguished triangle $K \to Y \to L \to K[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $K \in \varepsilon^{\wedge}_{d-1}(\mathcal{Y})$. Applying the cohomological functor $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(-, M[j])$, with $M \in \mathcal{X}$, to the above triangle, we get and exact sequence of abelian groups

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(K[1], M[j]) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(L, M[j]) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(Y, M[j]).$$

By induction, we know that $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(K) \leq \alpha + d - 1$. Therefore $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(L, M[j]) = 0$ for $j > \alpha + d$ and so $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) \leq \alpha + d$.

(b) Let $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}} \cap^{\perp} \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}[1]$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$. Consider $L \in \mathcal{Y}^{\wedge}$ and let $d := \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{Y}}(L)$. By 3.2 we have that $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) = 0$ and then $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) \leq d$ (see (a)). We prove, by induction on d, that the equality given in (b) holds. For $d = 0$ it is clear.
Suppose that $d = 1$. Then, there is a distinguished triangle

$$\eta: \quad Y_1 \to Y_0 \to L \xrightarrow{f} Y_1[1] \text{ in } \mathcal{T} \text{ with } Y_i \in \mathcal{Y}.$$

If $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) = 0$ then $L \in {}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}[1]$ (see 3.2). Hence $f = 0$ since $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$; and therefore η splits giving us that $L \in \mathcal{Y}$, which is a contradiction since $d = 1$. So $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) > 0$ proving (b) for $d = 1$.
Assume now that $d \geq 2$. Thus we have a distinguished triangle $K \to Y \to L \to K[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, $K \in \varepsilon^{\wedge}_{d-1}(\mathcal{Y})$ and $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(K) = d - 1$ (by inductive hypothesis). Since $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) \leq d$, it is enough to see $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) > d-1$. So, in case $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) \leq d - 1$, we apply the cohomological functor $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(-, X[d])$, with $X \in \mathcal{X}$, to the triangle $L \to K[1] \to Y[1] \to L[1]$. Then we get the following exact sequence of abelian groups

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(Y[1], X[d]) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(K[1], X[d]) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(L, X[d]).$$

Therefore $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(K[1], X[d]) = 0$ contradicting that $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(K) = d - 1$. This means that $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) > d - 1$; proving (b). □

Remark 3.5. *Note that if* $Y \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}} \cap {}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}[1]$ *then* $Y[j] \notin \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}} \cap {}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}[1]$ $\forall j > 0$.

The following technical result will be used in the Section 4.

Lemma 3.6. *Let* $\mathcal{X}$*,* $\mathcal{Y}$ *and* $\mathcal{Z}$ *be classes of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$*. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee}) = \mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X})$.

(b) *If* $\mathcal{X} \subseteq Z \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{\vee}$ *then* $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{Z}) = \mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X})$.

Proof. To prove (a), it is enough to see that $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}\,(\mathcal{X}^\vee) \leq \mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}\,(\mathcal{X})$. Let $M \in \mathcal{X}^\vee$. We prove by induction on $d := \mathrm{coresdim}_{\mathcal{X}}\,(M)$ that $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}\,(M) \leq \mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}\,(\mathcal{X})$. We may assume that $\alpha := \mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}\,(\mathcal{X}) < \infty$. If $d = 0$ then we have that $M \in \mathcal{X}$ and there is nothing to prove.

Let $d \geq 1$. Then we have a distinguished triangle $M \to X \to K \to M[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X \in \mathcal{X}$, $K \in \varepsilon^\vee_{d-1}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}\,(K) \leq \alpha$ (by inductive hypothesis). Applying the cohomological functor $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(-, Y[i])$, with $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, we get the exact sequence of abelian groups

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X, Y[i]) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(M, Y[i]) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(K, Y[i+1]).$$

Therefore $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(M, Y[i]) = 0$ for $i > \alpha$ since $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}\,(K) \leq \alpha$. So we get that $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}\,(\mathcal{X}^\vee) \leq \mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}\,(\mathcal{X})$.

Finally, it is easy to see that (b) is a consequence of (a). □

The following two lemmas resembles the so called "shifting argument" that is usually used for syzygies and cosyzygies in the Ext^n functor.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ such that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) = 0$. Then, for any $X \in \mathcal{X}$, $k > 0$ and $K_n \in \mathcal{Y} * \mathcal{Y}[1] * \cdots * \mathcal{Y}[n-1] * K_0[n]$, there is an isomorphism of abelian groups*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X, K_0[k+n]) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X, K_n[k]).$$

Proof. Let $X \in \mathcal{X}$, $k > 0$ and $K_n \in \mathcal{Y} * \mathcal{Y}[1] * \cdots * \mathcal{Y}[n-1] * K_0[n]$. By 2.8 (a), we have distinguished triangles $\eta_i : \quad K_i \to Y_i \to K_{i+1} \to K_i[1]$ with $Y_i \in \mathcal{Y},\ 0 \leq i \leq n-1$. Applying the functor $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X[-k], -)$ to η_i, we get the exact sequence of abelian groups

$$(X[-k], Y_i) \to (X[-k], K_{i+1}) \to (X[-k], K_i[1]) \to (X[-k], Y_i[1]),$$

where $(-,-) := \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(-,-)$ for simplicity. Since $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) = 0$, it follows that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X[-k], K_{i+1}) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X[-k], K_i[1])$. Therefore, by the preceding isomorphism, we have
$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X, K_n[k]) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X, K_{n-1}[k+1]) \simeq \cdots \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X, K_0[k+n])$. □

Lemma 3.8. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ such that $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) = 0$. Then, for any $X \in \mathcal{X}$, $k > 0$ and $K_n \in K_0[-n] * \mathcal{Y}[-n+1] * \cdots * \mathcal{Y}[-1] * \mathcal{Y}$, there is an isomorphism of abelian groups*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(K_0, X[k+n]) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{T}(K_n, X[k]).$$

Proof. The proof is similar to the one given in 3.7 by using 2.8 (b). □

4. RELATIVE WEAK-COGENERATORS AND RELATIVE INJECTIVES

In this section, we focus our attention on pairs $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. We study the relationship between weak-cogenerators in $\mathcal{X}$ and coresolutions. Also, we give a characterization of some special subcategories of $\mathcal{T}$.

Definition 4.1. *Let $(\mathcal{X},\omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. We say that*

(a) *ω is a* **weak-cogenerator** *in $\mathcal{X}$, if $\omega\subseteq\mathcal{X}\subseteq\mathcal{X}[-1]*\omega$;*
(b) *ω is a* **weak-generator** *in $\mathcal{X}$, if $\omega\subseteq\mathcal{X}\subseteq\omega*\mathcal{X}[1]$;*
(c) *ω is* **$\mathcal{X}$-injective** *if $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega)=0$; and dually, ω is* **$\mathcal{X}$-projective** *if $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega)=0$.*

The following result say us that an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator, closed under direct summands, is unique (in case there exists).

Proposition 4.2. *Let $(\mathcal{X},\omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ such that ω is $\mathcal{X}$-injective. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) *$\omega^{\wedge}$ is $\mathcal{X}$-injective.*
(b) *If ω is a weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$, and ω is closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$, then*

$$\omega=\mathcal{X}\cap{}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1]=\mathcal{X}\cap\omega^{\wedge}.$$

Proof. (a) It follows from the dual result of 3.6 (a).

(b) Let $\omega\subseteq\mathcal{X}\subseteq\mathcal{X}[-1]*\omega$ and ω be closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$.

We start by proving the first equality. Let $X\in\mathcal{X}\cap{}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1]$. Since $\mathcal{X}\subseteq\mathcal{X}[-1]*\omega$, there is a distinguished triangle

$$\eta:\quad X\to W\to X'\xrightarrow{f}X[1]\text{ in }\mathcal{T}\text{ with }X'\in\mathcal{X}\text{ and }W\in\omega.$$

Moreover $X\in{}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1]$ implies that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(-,X[1])|_{\mathcal{X}}=0$ (see 2.7 (b)). Hence η splits and so $X\in\omega$; proving that $\mathcal{X}\cap{}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1]\subseteq\omega$. The other inclusion follows from 3.2 (a2) since $\omega\subseteq\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega)=0$.
On the other hand, it is easy to see that $\omega\subseteq\mathcal{X}\cap\omega^{\wedge}$ and since $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega^{\wedge})=0$, it follows from 3.2 (a2) that $\mathcal{X}\cap\omega^{\wedge}\subseteq\mathcal{X}\cap{}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1]$; proving (b). □

Proposition 4.3. *Let $(\mathcal{X},\omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, and ω be closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$. If ω is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$, then*

$$\mathcal{X}\cap\omega^{\vee}=\{X\in\mathcal{X}\,:\,\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(X)<\infty\}.$$

Proof. Let $M\in\mathcal{X}\cap\omega^{\vee}$. We assert that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(M)\leq d<\infty$ where $d:=\mathrm{coresdim}_{\omega}(M)$. Indeed, from 2.2 (a) and 2.8 (a), there is some $W_d\in\omega*\omega[1]*\cdots*\omega[d-1]*M[d]$ with $W_d\in\omega$. So, by 3.7 we get an isomorphism $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X,M[k+d])\simeq\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X,W_d[k])$ for any $k>0$; and using that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega)=0$, it follows that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X,M[k+d])=0$ for any $k>0$, proving that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(M)\leq d$.

Let $N\in\mathcal{X}$ be such that $n:=\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(N)<\infty$. Using that $\mathcal{X}\subseteq\mathcal{X}[-1]*\omega$, we can construct a family $\{K_i\to W_i\to K_{i+1}\to K_i[1]\,:\,W_i\in\omega,\ 0\leq i\leq n-1\}$ of distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$ where $K_0:=N$ and $K_i\in\mathcal{X}$, $\forall i\ 0\leq i\leq n$. Thus, by 2.8 (a), it follows that $K_n\in\omega*\omega[1]*\cdots*\omega[n-1]*N[n]$; and so by 3.7 we get that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X,K_n[k])\simeq\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X,N[k+n])$, $\forall X\in\mathcal{X}$, $\forall k>0$. But $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X,N[k+n])=0$, $\forall X\in\mathcal{X}$, $\forall k>0$ because $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(N)=n$. Therefore

$\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(K_n)=0$ and then $K_n\in\omega$ (see 3.2 and 4.2 (b)); proving that $N\in\mathcal{X}\cap\omega^{\vee}$. $\square$

Now, we are in condition to prove the following result. In the statement, we use the notions of precovering and preenveloping classes (see Section 1).

Theorem 4.4. *Let $(\mathcal{X},\omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, $\mathcal{X}$ be closed under extensions and ω be a weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) *For all $C\in\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ there exist two distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$:*
$C[-1]\longrightarrow Y_C\longrightarrow X_C\xrightarrow{\varphi_C} C$ *with* $Y_C\in\omega^{\wedge}$ *and* $X_C\in\mathcal{X}$,

$C\xrightarrow{\varphi^C} Y^C\longrightarrow X^C\longrightarrow C[1]$ *with* $Y^C\in\omega^{\wedge}$ *and* $X^C\in\mathcal{X}$.

(b) *If ω is $\mathcal{X}$-injective, then*

   (b1) $Y_C[1]\in\mathcal{X}^{\perp}$ *and φ_C is an $\mathcal{X}$-precover of C,*

   (b2) $X^C[-1]\in{}^{\perp}(\omega^{\wedge})$ *and φ^C is a $\omega^{\wedge}$-preenvelope of C.*

Proof. (a) Let $C\in\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$. We prove the existence of the triangles in (a) by induction on $n:=\mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(C)$. If $n=0$, we have that $C\in\mathcal{X}$ and then we can consider $C[-1]\to 0\to C\overset{1_C}{\to} C$ as the first triangle; the second one can be obtained from the fact that $\mathcal{X}\subseteq\mathcal{X}[-1]*\omega$.

Assume that $n>0$. Then, we have a distinguished triangle $C[-1]\to K_1\to X_0\to C$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X_0\in\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(K_1)=n-1$. Hence, by induction, there is a distinguished triangle $K_1\to Y^{K_1}\to X^{K_1}\to K_1[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y^{K_1}\in\omega^{\wedge}$ and $X^{K_1}\in\mathcal{X}$. By the co-base change procedure applied to the above triangles, there exists a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & X^{K_1}[-1] \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d] & X^{K_1}[-1] \arrow[d] & \\
C[-1] \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & K_1 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & X_0 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & C \arrow[d, equal] \\
C[-1] \arrow[r] & Y^{K_1} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & U \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & C \\
 & X^{K_1} \arrow[r, equal] & X^{K_1} &
\end{tikzcd}$$

where the rows and columns are distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$. Since $X_0, X^{K_1}\in\mathcal{X}$ it follows that $U\in\mathcal{X}$. By taking $X_C:=U$ and $Y_C:=Y^{K_1}$, we get the first triangle in (a). On the other hand, since $U\in\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{X}\subseteq\mathcal{X}[-1]*\omega$, there exists a distinguished triangle $X^C[-1]\to U\to W\to X^C$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with

$X^C \in \mathcal{X}$ and $W \in \omega$. Again, by the co-base change procedure, there exists a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & Y^{K_1} \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d] & Y^{K_1} \arrow[d] & \\
X^C[-1] \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & U \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & W \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & X^C \arrow[d, equal] \\
X^C[-1] \arrow[r] & C \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & Y^C \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & X^C \\
 & Y^{K_1}[1] \arrow[r, equal] & Y^{K_1}[1] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

where the rows and columns are distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$. By the second column, in the diagram above, it follows that $Y^C \in \omega^\wedge$. Hence the second row in the preceding diagram is the desired triangle.

(b2) Consider the triangle $X^C[-1] \xrightarrow{g} C \xrightarrow{\varphi^C} Y^C \to X^C$ with $Y^C \in \omega^\wedge$ and $X^C \in \mathcal{X}$. Since $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega) = 0$ we have by 4.2 that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega^\wedge) = 0$. Thus $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X[-1], -)|_{\omega^\wedge} = 0$ for any $X \in \mathcal{X}$; and so $X^C[-1] \in {}^{\perp}(\omega^\wedge)$. Let $f : C \to Y$ be a morphism in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y \in \omega^\wedge$. Since $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X^C[-1], Y) = 0$, we have that $fg = 0$ and hence f factors through φ^C; proving that φ^C is a $\omega^\wedge$-preenvelope of C.

(b1) It is similar to the proof of (b2). $\square$

The following result provides a characterization of the category $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$.

Corollary 4.5. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ such that $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under extensions and ω is a weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) *If $0 \in \omega$ then $\mathcal{X}^\wedge = \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge = \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge[1]$.*

(b) *If $\mathcal{X}[-1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ then $\mathcal{X}^\wedge = \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge = \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge[1] = \mathcal{X}[-1] * \omega^\wedge$.*

Proof. We assert that $\mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge$. Indeed, since $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ it follows from 2.4 (a) that $\varepsilon_n^\wedge(\omega) \subseteq \varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$, giving us that $\omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge$. Hence $\mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \mathcal{X}^\wedge$ and then $\mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge$ by 2.4 (c).

(a) Let $0 \in \omega$. By 4.4 (a) we have that $\mathcal{X}^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge[1]$, and therefore, by 2.2 (d) we get $\mathcal{X}^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge[1] \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge$. But $\mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \mathcal{X}^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge$ by 2.4 (c), and then $\mathcal{X}^\wedge = \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge = \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge[1]$.

(b) Let $\mathcal{X}[-1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. By 4.4 (a) and the assertion above, we have $\mathcal{X}^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X}[-1] * \omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge$. On the other hand, from 4.4 (a), it follows that $\mathcal{X}^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge[1]$. So, to prove (b), it is enough to see that $\mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge[1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge$. Let

$C \in \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge[1]$. Then there is a distinguished triangle $Y \to X \to C \to Y[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $Y \in \omega^\wedge$. Hence it follows that $C \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge$ since $\omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge$; proving (b). $\square$

We are now in position to prove that if ω is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator in a suitable class $\mathcal{X}$, then the $\omega^\wedge$-projective dimension coincides with the $\mathcal{X}$-resolution dimension for every object of the thick subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ generated by $\mathcal{X}$.

Theorem 4.6. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ which are closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$. If $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under extensions and ω is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$, then*

$$\mathrm{pd}_{\omega^\wedge}(C) = \mathrm{pd}_{\omega}(C) = \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(C), \quad \forall C \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge.$$

Proof. Let $C \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge$. By 3.2 (b) and the dual of 3.6 (a), it follows that $\mathrm{pd}_{\omega}(C) = \mathrm{id}_{\{C\}}(\omega) = \mathrm{id}_{\{C\}}(\omega^\wedge) = \mathrm{pd}_{\omega^\wedge}(C)$. To prove the last equality, we proceed by induction on $n := \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(C)$. To start with, we have $\mathrm{pd}_{\omega}(\mathcal{X}) = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega) = 0$. If $n = 0$ then $C \in \mathcal{X}$ and so $\mathrm{pd}_{\omega}(C) = 0 = \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(C)$.

Let $n = 1$. Then, we have a distinguished triangle $X_1 \to X_0 \to C \to X_1[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X_i \in \mathcal{X}$. By 4.4 (a), there is a distinguished triangle $Y_C \to X_C \overset{\varphi_C}{\to} C \to Y_C[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y_C \in \omega^\wedge$ and $X_C \in \mathcal{X}$. By the base change procedure, there exists a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & Y_C \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d] & Y_C \arrow[d] & \\
X_1 \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & E \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & X_C \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\varphi_C"'] & X_1[1] \arrow[d, equal] \\
X_1 \arrow[r] & X_0 \arrow[r, "\alpha"] \arrow[d] & C \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\beta"'] & X_1[1] \\
 & Y_C[1] \arrow[r, equal] & Y_C[1], &
\end{tikzcd}$$

where the rows and columns are distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$. Since $X_1, X_C \in \mathcal{X}$ it follows that $E \in \mathcal{X}$. On the other hand, since $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X, Y[1]) = 0$ for any $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $Y \in \omega^\wedge$ (see 4.2 (a)), we get that $\beta\alpha = 0$ and then the triangle $Y_C \to E \to X_0 \to Y_C[1]$ splits getting us that $Y_C \in \mathcal{X} \cap \omega^\wedge = \omega$ (see 4.2). On the other hand, using that $\mathrm{pd}_{\omega}(\mathcal{X}) = 0$ and 3.4 (a), we have that $\mathrm{pd}_{\omega}(C) \leq \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) = 1$. We assert that $\mathrm{pd}_{\omega}(C) > 0$. Indeed, suppose that $\mathrm{pd}_{\omega}(C) = 0$; and then $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(C, W[1]) = 0$ for any $W \in \omega$. Since $Y_C \in \omega$ we get that $\beta = 0$ and hence the triangle $Y_C \to X_C \to C \to Y_C[1]$ splits. Therefore $C \in \mathcal{X}$ contradicting that $\mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) = 1$; proving that $\mathrm{pd}_{\omega}(C) = 1 = \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(C)$.

Let $n \geq 2$. From 3.4 (a), we have that $\mathrm{pd}_{\omega}(C) \leq \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) = n$ since $\mathrm{pd}_{\omega}(\mathcal{X}) = 0$. Then, it is enough to prove that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(C[-n], -)|_{\omega} \neq 0$. Consider a distinguished triangle $K_1 \to X_0 \to C \to K_1[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(K_1) = n-1 = \mathrm{pd}_{\omega}(K_1)$. Applying the functor $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(-, W[n])$, with $W \in \omega$, to the triangle $C \to K_1[1] \to X_0[1] \to C[1]$ we get the exact sequence of abelian groups

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X_0[1], W[n]) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(K_1[1], W[n]) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(C, W[n]).$$

Suppose that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(C[-n], -)|_{\omega} = 0$. Then $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(K_1[1], W[n]) = 0$ since $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega) = 0$ and $n \geq 2$; contradicting that $\mathrm{pd}_{\omega}(K_1) = n-1$. □

Lemma 4.7. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ and $A \to B \to C \to A[1]$ a distinguished triangle in $\mathcal{T}$. Then*

(a) $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(B) \leq \max\{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(A), \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C)\}$;

(b) $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(A) \leq \max\{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(B), \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C)+1\}$;

(c) $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) \leq \max\{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(B), \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(A)-1\}$.

Proof. It is straightforward. □

Proposition 4.8. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ such that $\omega \subseteq {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}$. If ω is closed under direct summands and $\mathcal{X}$-injective, then*

$$\mathrm{id}_{\omega}(C) = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) = \mathrm{coresdim}_{\omega}(C), \quad \forall\, C \in {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U} \cap \omega^{\vee}.$$

Proof. Assume that ω is closed under direct summands and $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega) = 0$. Let $C \in {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U} \cap \omega^{\vee}$ and $n := \mathrm{coresdim}_{\omega}(C)$. By the dual of 3.4 (b), it follows

$$(*) \quad \alpha := \mathrm{id}_{\omega}(C) \leq \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) = \mathrm{coresdim}_{\omega}(C) = n.$$

Moreover, since $C \in \omega^{\vee}$ there is a distinguished triangle $(\eta)\ :\ C \to W_0 \to K_1 \to C[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $W_0 \in \omega$ and $\mathrm{coresdim}_{\omega}(K_1) = n-1$. Furthermore, from 2.2 (a) we get that $K_1 \in {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}$ since ${}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}$ is closed under cocones and $\omega \subseteq {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}$. Now, we prove the result by induction on α.

Let $\alpha = 0$. We assert that $C \in \omega$ (note that if this is true, then the result follows). We proceed by induction on n. If $n = 0$ it is clear that $C \in \omega$. So we may assume that $n > 0$, and then, applying 4.7 to (η) it follows that $\mathrm{id}_{\omega}(K_1) = 0$. Hence by induction we get that $K_1 \in \omega$, and so $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(K_1, C[1]) = 0$ since $\mathrm{id}_{\omega}(C) = 0$. Therefore the triangle (η) splits and then $C \in \omega$; proving the assertion.

Assume that $\alpha > 0$. Applying 4.7 to (η), we get that $\mathrm{id}_{\omega}(K_1) \leq \alpha - 1$. Thus, by induction, it follows that $\mathrm{id}_{\omega}(K_1) = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(K_1) = \mathrm{coresdim}_{\omega}(K_1) = n-1$. In particular, we obtain that $n-1 \leq \alpha - 1$ and hence by $(*)$ the result follows. □

Proposition 4.9. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ such that ω is closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$, $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under extensions and ω is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) ${}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1] \cap \mathcal{X}^{\wedge} = \omega^{\wedge}$.

(b) *If* $\mathcal{X}[-1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ *then* $\mathcal{U}_{\omega} = \omega^{\wedge} = \mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1] \cap \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$.

Proof. (a) Let $C \in {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1] \cap \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$. In particular, from 4.4 (a), there exists a distinguished triangle $Y_C \to X_C \to C \to Y_C[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y_C \in \omega^{\wedge}$ and $X_C \in \mathcal{X}$. We assert that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(X_C) = 0$. Indeed, it follows from 4.7 (a) since $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) = 0 = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(Y_C)$ (see 3.2 and 4.2 (a)). Therefore, $X_C \in \mathcal{X} \cap {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1]$ and by 4.2 (b), we get that $X_C \in \omega$ proving that $C \in \omega^{\wedge}$. On the other hand, since $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega^{\wedge}) = 0$, we have from 3.2 that $\omega^{\wedge} \subseteq {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1] \cap \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$.

(b) Assume that $\mathcal{X}[-1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. Hence, by 1.1 (b), we have that $\mathcal{X}$ is a cosuspended subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$. Therefore, from (a), it follows that $\omega^{\wedge} = \mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1] \cap \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$. Furthermore, since $\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1]$ is suspended and $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ is triangulated (see 2.5), we conclude that $\omega^{\wedge}$ is a suspended subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$; and so $\mathcal{U}_{\omega} \subseteq \omega^{\wedge}$. Finally, the equality $\mathcal{U}_{\omega} = \omega^{\wedge}$ follows from 2.6 (3). □

Theorem 4.10. *Let* $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ *be a pair of classes of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$ *which are closed under direct summands,* $\mathcal{X}$ *be cosuspended and* ω *be an* $\mathcal{X}$*-injective weak-cogenerator in* $\mathcal{X}$. *Then,*

$$\varepsilon_n^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{X}[n] = \mathcal{X}^{\wedge} \cap {}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\omega}[n+1] = \mathcal{X}^{\wedge} \cap {}^{\perp}(\omega^{\wedge})[n+1], \quad \forall n \geq 0.$$

Proof. From 2.5, we have that $\varepsilon_n^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{X}[n]$ and $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge} = \cup_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{X}[n]$. On the other hand, by 3.2 and 4.6, it follows that

$$\mathcal{X}^{\wedge} \cap {}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\omega^{\wedge}}[n+1] = \mathcal{X}^{\wedge} \cap {}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\omega}[n+1] = \mathcal{X}[n] \cap \mathcal{X}^{\wedge} = \mathcal{X}[n].$$

Finally, since $\omega^{\wedge}$ is a suspended subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ (see 4.9 (b)), we have that ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\omega^{\wedge}} = {}^{\perp}(\omega^{\wedge})$; proving the result. □

Definition 4.11. *For a given class* $\mathcal{Y}$ *of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$, *we set* $\mathcal{Y}^{\sim} := (\mathcal{Y}^{\wedge})^{\vee}$.

Lemma 4.12. *Let* $\mathcal{X}$ *be a class of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$. *Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) *If* $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ *is closed under cocones then* $\omega^{\sim} \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ *for any* $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{X}$.

(b) $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ *is closed under cocones if and only if* $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge} = \mathcal{X}^{\sim}$.

(c) *If* $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge} = \mathcal{X}^{\sim}$ *then* $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}[-1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$.

Proof. (a) Let $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ and assume that $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ is closed under cocones. Hence $\omega^{\wedge} \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ and so by 2.6 (2), we conclude that $\omega^{\sim} \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$.

(b) Assume that $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ is closed under cocones. It is clear that $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge} \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{\sim}$. On the other hand, by (a) it follows that $\mathcal{X}^{\sim} \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$.

Suppose that $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge} = \mathcal{X}^{\sim}$. Let $A \to B \to C \to A[1]$ be a distinguished triangle in $\mathcal{T}$ with B, C in $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$. Then $A \in \mathcal{X}^{\sim} = \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ and so $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ is closed under cocones.

(c) Let $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge} = \mathcal{X}^{\sim}$ and consider $X \in \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$. Since, we have the distinguished triangle $X[-1] \to 0 \to X \xrightarrow{1_X} X$ and $0, X \in \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$, it follows from (b) that $X[-1] \in \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$; proving the lemma. □

Corollary 4.13. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. If $\mathcal{X}$ is cosuspended and $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, then $\omega^{\sim} \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{\wedge} = \mathcal{X}^{\sim}$.*

Proof. It follows from 4.12 and the fact that $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ is triangulated (see 2.5). □

In case ω is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator in a cosuspended subcategory $\mathcal{X}$ of $\mathcal{T}$, both closed under direct summands, the thick subcategory $\overline{\Delta}_{\mathcal{T}}(\omega)$ of $\mathcal{T}$ can be characterized as follows.

Theorem 4.14. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, $\mathcal{X}$ be cosuspended and ω be closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$. If ω is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$, the following statements hold.*

(a) $\omega^{\sim} = \{C \in \mathcal{X}^{\wedge} : \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) < \infty\} = \mathcal{X}^{\wedge} \cap (\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1])^{\vee}$.

(b) $\omega^{\sim}$ *is the smallest triangulated subcategory of* $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ *containing* ω, *that is* $\omega^{\sim} = \Delta_{\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}}(\omega)$.

(c) *If* $\mathcal{X}$ *is closed under direct summands in* $\mathcal{T}$, *then*

$$\overline{\Delta}_{\mathcal{T}}(\omega) = \omega^{\sim} = \overline{\Delta}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X}) \cap (\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1])^{\vee}.$$

Proof. Assume that $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{X}[-1] * \omega$ and $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega) = 0$. Let $\mathcal{Y} := \{C \in \mathcal{X}^{\wedge} : \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) < \infty\}$. We start by proving that $\omega^{\sim} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$. By 4.13, we know that $\omega^{\sim} \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$. On the other hand, since $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega^{\wedge}) = 0$ (see 4.2(a)), we can apply the dual of 3.4(a), and then $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) \leq \mathrm{coresdim}_{\omega^{\wedge}}(C) < \infty$ for any $C \in \omega^{\sim}$; proving that $\omega^{\sim} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$.
Let $C \in \mathcal{Y}$. By 4.4 (a), there is a distinguished triangle $C \to Y^C \to X^C \to C[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y^C \in \omega^{\wedge}$ and $X^C \in \mathcal{X}$. Hence, from 4.7 (b) we get that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(X^C) < \infty$ and then, by 4.3 $X^C \in \omega^{\vee} \subseteq \omega^{\sim}$; proving that $C \in \omega^{\sim}$. Hence $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \omega^{\sim}$. In order to get the second equality in (a), we use 3.2 and the fact that $\mathcal{X} = {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}$ to obtain

$$\{C \in \mathcal{X}^{\wedge} : \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) < \infty\} = \mathcal{X}^{\wedge} \cap (\cup_{n \geq 0}\, \mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-n-1]).$$

On the other hand, since $\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1]$ is suspended, then by the dual of 2.5, it follows that $(\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1])^{\vee} = \cup_{n \geq 0}\, \mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-n-1]$ and also that $(\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1])^{\vee}$ is a thick subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$. In particular, by 2.5, we get (b). Finally, (c) follows from (a) and 2.5. □

Proposition 4.15. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, $\mathcal{X}$ cosuspended and ω closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$. If ω is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$, then*

(a) $\mathrm{id}_{\omega}(C) = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C), \quad \forall C \in \omega^{\sim}$;

(b) $\omega^{\sim} \cap {}_{\omega}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-n-1] = \omega^{\sim} \cap \mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-n-1], \quad \forall n \geq 0$.

Proof. (a) By 2.5 and 4.14, we know that $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ and $\omega^{\sim}$ are triangulated subcategories of $\mathcal{T}$. Furthermore, from 4.13 it follows that $\omega^{\sim} \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$. Let

$C \in \omega^{\sim}$. It is enough to prove that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) \leq \mathrm{id}_{\omega}(C)$. In order to do that, we will use induction on $n := \mathrm{id}_{\omega}(C)$.

Since $C \in \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$, we have from 4.4 the existence of a distinguished triangle $(\eta)\ :\ C \to Y^C \to X^C \to C[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y^C \in \omega^{\wedge} \subseteq \omega^{\sim}$ and $X^C \in \mathcal{X}$. We assert that $X^C \in \mathcal{X} \cap \omega^{\vee}$. Indeed, using that $\omega^{\sim}$ is triangulated we conclude that $X^C \in \mathcal{X} \cap \omega^{\sim}$ and hence $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(X^C)$ is finite (see 4.14 (a)). Thus $X^C \in \mathcal{X} \cap \omega^{\vee}$ by 4.3; proving the assertion.

Let $n = 0$. Then $\mathrm{id}_{\omega}(X^C) = 0$ since $\mathrm{id}_{\omega}(Y^C) = 0$ (see 4.2 and 4.7). On the other hand, 4.8 gives the equalities $\mathrm{coresdim}_{\omega}(X^C) = \mathrm{id}_{\omega}(X^C) = 0$. Hence $X^C \in \omega$ and since $\mathrm{id}_{\omega}(C) = 0$, it follows that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X^C, C[1]) = 0$. Therefore, the triangle (η) splits giving us that C is a direct summand of Y^C, and hence $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) \leq \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(Y^C) \leq \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega^{\wedge}) = 0$.

Assume that $n > 0$. Since $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(Y^C) = 0 = \mathrm{id}_{\omega}(Y^C)$, it follows from 4.7 that $\mathrm{id}_{\omega}(X^C) \leq n-1$. Hence, by induction $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(X^C) \leq \mathrm{id}_{\omega}(X^C) \leq n-1$. Therefore, applying again 4.7 to the triangle (η), we get that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) \leq n = \mathrm{id}_{\omega}(C)$; proving the result.

(b) By 3.2, the item (a) and the fact that ${}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{X}$ the result follows. $\square$

References

[1] L. Angeleri Hügel, O. Mendoza. Homological dimensions in cotorsion pairs. *Illinois J. Math.* 53, no1 (2009), 251-263.

[2] M. Auslander, R.O. Buchweitz. The Homological theory of maximal Cohen-Macaulay approximations. *Societe Mathematique de France* 38 (1989), 5-37.

[3] M. Auslander, I. Reiten. Applications of contravariantly finite subcategories. *Advances in Math.* 86 (1991), 111-152.

[4] M. Auslander, S. O. Smalo. Preprojective modules over artin algebra. *J. Algebra* 66 (1980), 61-122.

[5] A. A. Beilinson, J. Bernstein, P. Deligne. Faisceaux pervers. *Asterisque* 100 (1982).

[6] M. V. Bondarko. Weight structures for triangulated categories: weight filtrations, weight spectral sequences and weight complexes, applications to motives and to the stable homotopy category. Preprint available at http://arxiv.org/abs/0704.4003v1

[7] A. B. Buan. Subcategories of the derived category and cotilting complexes. *Colloq. Math.* 88 (2001), no. 1, 1-11.

[8] A. Beligiannis, I. Reiten. Homological and homotopical aspects of torsion theories. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* 188 (2007) no. 883.

[9] E. Enochs. Injective and flat covers, envelopes and resolvents. *Israel J. Math.* 39 (1981), 189-209.

[10] M. Hashimoto. Auslander-Buchweitz approximations of equivariant modules. *LMS, Lecture Notes Series* 282 (2000) Cambridge University Press.

[11] O. Mendoza, C. Sáenz. Tilting categories with applications to stratifying systems. *Journal of Algebra,* 302 (2006) 419-449.

[12] O. Mendoza, C. Sáenz, V. Santiago, M. J. Souto Salorio. Auslander-Buchwetiz context and co-t-structures. *Preprint* 2010.

[13] D. Pauksztello. Compact corigid objects in triangulated categories and co-t-structures. *Cent. Eur. J. Math.* 6 (2008), no. 1, 25-42.

Octavio Mendoza Hernández:
Instituto de Matemáticas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
Circuito Exterior, Ciudad Universitaria, C.P. 04510, México, D.F. MEXICO.
`omendoza@matem.unam.mx`

Edith Corina Sáenz Valadez:
Departamento de Matemáticas, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
Circuito Exterior, Ciudad Universitaria, C.P. 04510, México, D.F. MEXICO.
`ecsv@lya.fciencias.unam.mx`

Valente Santiago Vargas:
Instituto de Matemáticas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
Circuito Exterior, Ciudad Universitaria, C.P. 04510, México, D.F. MEXICO.
`valente@matem.unam.mx`

María José Souto Salorio:
Facultade de Informática, Universidade da Coruña
15071 A Coruña, ESPAÑA.
`mariaj@udc.es`

arXiv:1002.3926v4 [math.CT] 9 Oct 2011

AUSLANDER-BUCHWEITZ APPROXIMATION THEORY FOR TRIANGULATED CATEGORIES

O. MENDOZA, E. C. SÁENZ, V. SANTIAGO, M. J. SOUTO SALORIO.

Abstract. We introduce and develop an analogous of the Auslander-Buchweitz approximation theory (see [2]) in the context of triangulated categories, by using a version of relative homology in this setting. We also prove several results concerning relative homological algebra in a triangulated category $\mathcal{T}$, which are based on the behaviour of certain subcategories under finiteness of resolutions and vanishing of Hom-spaces. For example: we establish the existence of preenvelopes (and precovers) in certain triangulated subcategories of $\mathcal{T}$. The results resemble various constructions and results of Auslander and Buchweitz, and are concentrated in exploring the structure of a triangulated category $\mathcal{T}$ equipped with a pair $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$, where $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under extensions and ω is a weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$, usually under additional conditions. This reduces, among other things, to the existence of distinguished triangles enjoying special properties, and the behaviour of (suitably defined) (co)resolutions, projective or injective dimension of objects of $\mathcal{T}$ and the formation of orthogonal subcategories. Finally, some relationships with the Rouquier's dimension in triangulated categories is discussed.

Introduction.

The approximation theory has its origin with the concept of injective envelopes and it has had a wide development in the context of module categories since the fifties.

In independent papers, Auslander, Reiten and Smalo (for the category $\operatorname{mod}(\Lambda)$ of finitely generated modules over an artin algebra Λ), and Enochs (for the category $\operatorname{Mod}(R)$ of modules over an arbitrary ring R) introduced a general approximation theory involving precovers and preenvelopes (see [3], [4] and [9]).

Auslander and Buchweitz (see [2]) studied the ideas of injective envelopes and projective covers in terms of maximal Cohen-Macaulay approximations for certain modules. In their work, they also studied the relationship between the relative injective dimension and the coresolution dimension of a module.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 18E30 and 18G20. Secondary 18G25.
The authors thank the financial support received from Project PAPIIT-UNAM IN101607 and MICINN-FEDER TIN2010-18552-C03-02.

They developed their theory in the context of abelian categories providing important applications in several settings.

Based on [2], Hashimoto defined the so called "Auslander-Buchweitz context" for abelian categories, giving a new framework to homological approximation theory (see [10]).

Recently, triangulated categories entered into the subject in a relevant way and several authors have studied the concept of approximation in both contexts, abelian and triangulated categories (see, for example, [1] [7], [8] and [14]).

In this paper, an analogous theory of approximations in the sense of Auslander and Buchweitz (see [2]), is developed for triangulated categories. Throughout this paper, $\mathcal{T}$ denotes an arbitrary triangulated category and $\mathcal{X}$ a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. The main result (Theorem 4.4) deals with a pair $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, where $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under extensions, and ω satisfies a weak cogenerating condition with respect to the objects of $\mathcal{X}$. Like Auslander and Buchweitz, we consider the class $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ of objects of $\mathcal{T}$ admitting a finite resolution by objects of $\mathcal{X}$. We prove that any object of $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ admits two distinguished triangles: one giving rise to a right $\mathcal{X}$-approximation, and the other to a left $\omega^\wedge$-approximation. In the present paper, it is also introduced and discussed a notion of $\mathcal{X}$-resolution dimension, which is compared with other relative homological dimensions.

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 1, we give some basic notions and properties of triangulated categories, that will be used in the rest of the work.

In Section 2, we study the notion of $\mathcal{X}$-resolution dimension which allows us to characterize the triangulated subcategory $\Delta_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X})$ of $\mathcal{T}$, generated by a cosuspended subcategory $\mathcal{X}$ of $\mathcal{T}$ (see Theorem 2.5).

In Section 3, the properties of the $\mathcal{X}$-projective (respectively, $\mathcal{X}$-injective) dimension and its relation to the $\mathcal{X}$-resolution (respectively, coresolution) dimension are established. The main result of this section is Theorem 3.4 that relates different kinds of relative homological dimensions by using suitable subcategories of $\mathcal{T}$.

In Section 4, we focus our attention to the notions of $\mathcal{X}$-injectives and weak-cogenerators in $\mathcal{X}$. We relate these ideas to the concepts of injective and coresolution dimension. This leads us to characterize several triangulated subcategories; and moreover, in Theorem 4.4 we establish the existence of $\mathcal{X}$-precovers and $\omega^\wedge$-preenvelopes. Finally, in Theorem 4.16, for a given pair $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ satisfying certain conditions, we give several characterizations of the triangulated subcategory $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}^\wedge}(\omega)$ of $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ generated by ω.

We remark that the results we get will be applied in a forthcoming paper [15], where a connection between Auslander-Buchweitz approximation theory in triangulated categories and co-t-structures (see [6] and [16]) is established.

Finally, some relationship with other notions, as torsion theories (see Corollary 4.12) in the sense of Iyama-Yoshino [11] and Rouquier's dimension [17], are discussed (see Section 5).

1. Preliminaries

Throughout this paper, $\mathcal{T}$ will be a triangulated category and $[1] : \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{T}$ its suspension functor. The term subcategory, in this paper, means a subcategory which is full, additive, and closed under isomorphisms.

An important tool, which is a consequence of the octahedral axiom in $\mathcal{T}$, is the so-called co-base change (see [12]). That is, for any diagram in $\mathcal{T}$

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & Y \\
Z &
\end{tikzcd}$$

there exists a commutative and exact diagram in $\mathcal{T}$

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & W[-1] \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d] & W[-1] \arrow[d] & \\
U[-1] \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & X \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & Y \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & U \arrow[d, equal] \\
U[-1] \arrow[r] & Z \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & E \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & U \\
 & W \arrow[r, equal] & W &
\end{tikzcd}$$

where exact means that the rows and columns, in the preceding diagram, are distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$. The base change, which is the dual notion of co-base change, also holds (see [12]).

Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. We put ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{X} := \{Z \in \mathcal{T} : \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(Z, -)|_{\mathcal{X}} = 0\}$ and $\mathcal{X}^{\perp} := \{Z \in \mathcal{T} : \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(-, Z)|_{\mathcal{X}} = 0\}$. We denote by $\mathcal{X} * \mathcal{Y}$ the class of objects $Z \in \mathcal{T}$ for which exists a distinguished triangle $X \to Z \to Y \to X[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$. In case $\mathcal{Y} = \{Y\}$, we write $\mathcal{X} * Y$ instead of $\mathcal{X} * \mathcal{Y}$.

It is also well known that the operation $*$ is associative (see [5, 1.3.10]). Furthermore, it is said that $\mathcal{X}$ is **closed under extensions** if $\mathcal{X} * \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$.

Recall that a class $\mathcal{X}$ of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ is said to be **suspended** (respectively, **cosuspended**) if $\mathcal{X}[1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ (respectively, $\mathcal{X}[-1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}$) and $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under extensions. By the following lemma, it is easy to see, that a suspended (respectively, cosuspended) class $\mathcal{X}$ of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, can be considered as a subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$.

Lemma 1.1. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$.*

(a) *If $0 \in \mathcal{X}$ then $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \mathcal{Y}$ and $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{Y} * \mathcal{X}$ for any class $\mathcal{Y}$ of objects in $\mathcal{T}$.*
(b) *If $\mathcal{X}$ is either suspended or cosuspended, then $0 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X} * \mathcal{X}$.*

Proof. (a) If $0 \in \mathcal{X}$ then we get $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \mathcal{Y}$ by using the distinguished triangle $0 \to Y \xrightarrow{1_Y} Y \to 0$ for any $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$. The other inclusion follows similarly.

(b) Let $\mathcal{X}$ be cosuspended (the other case, is analogous). Then, it follows that $0 \in \mathcal{X}$ since we have the distinguished triangle $X[-1] \to 0 \to X \to X$ for any $X \in \mathcal{X}$. Hence (b) follows from (a). $\square$

Given a class $\mathcal{X}$ of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, it is said that $\mathcal{X}$ is **closed under cones** if for any distinguished triangle $A \to B \to C \to A[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $A, B \in \mathcal{X}$ we have that $C \in \mathcal{X}$. Similarly, $\mathcal{X}$ is **closed under cocones** if for any distinguished triangle $A \to B \to C \to A[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $B, C \in \mathcal{X}$ we have that $A \in \mathcal{X}$.

We denote by $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ (respectively, ${}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}$) the smallest suspended (respectively, cosuspended) subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ containing the class $\mathcal{X}$. Note that if $\mathcal{X}$ is suspended (respectively, cosuspended) subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$, then $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ (respectively, $\mathcal{X} = {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}$). We also recall that a subcategory $\mathcal{U}$ of $\mathcal{T}$, which is suspended and cosuspended, is called **triangulated subcategory** of $\mathcal{T}$. A **thick** subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ is a triangulated subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ which is closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$. We also denote by $\Delta_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X})$ (respectively, $\overline{\Delta}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X})$) to the smallest triangulated (respectively, smallest thick) subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ containing the class $\mathcal{X}$. Observe that $\Delta_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \overline{\Delta}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X})$. For the following definition, see [3], [7], [8] and [9].

Definition 1.2. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be classes of objects in the triangulated category $\mathcal{T}$. A morphism $f : X \to C$ in $\mathcal{T}$ is said to be an* **$\mathcal{X}$-precover** *of C if $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X', f) : \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X', X) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X', C)$ is surjective, $\forall X' \in \mathcal{X}$. If any $C \in \mathcal{Y}$ admits an $\mathcal{X}$-precover, then $\mathcal{X}$ is called a* **precovering class** *in $\mathcal{Y}$. By dualizing the definition above, we get the notion of an* **$\mathcal{X}$-preenveloping** *of C and a* **preenveloping class** *in $\mathcal{Y}$.*

Finally, in order to deal with the (co)resolution, relative projective and relative injective dimensions, we consider the extended natural numbers $\overline{\mathbb{N}} := \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$. Here, we set the following rules: (a) $x + \infty = \infty$ for any $x \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}$, (b) $x < \infty$ for any $x \in \mathbb{N}$ and (c) $\min(\emptyset) := \infty$.

2. RESOLUTION AND CORESOLUTION DIMENSIONS

Now, we define certain classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ which will lead us to the notions of resolution and coresolution dimensions.

Definition 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. For any natural number n, we introduce inductively the class $\varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$ as follows: $\varepsilon_0^\wedge(\mathcal{X}) := \mathcal{X}$ and assuming defined $\varepsilon_{n-1}^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$, the class $\varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$ is given by all the objects $Z \in \mathcal{T}$ for which there exists a distinguished triangle in $\mathcal{T}$*

$$Z[-1] \longrightarrow W \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow Z$$

with $W \in \varepsilon_{n-1}^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$ and $X \in \mathcal{X}$.

Dually, we set $\varepsilon_0^\vee(\mathcal{X}) := \mathcal{X}$ and supposing defined $\varepsilon_{n-1}^\vee(\mathcal{X})$, the class $\varepsilon_n^\vee(\mathcal{X})$ is formed for all the objects $Z \in \mathcal{T}$ for which there exists a distinguished triangle in $\mathcal{T}$

$$Z \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow K \longrightarrow Z[1]$$

with $K \in \varepsilon_{n-1}^\vee(\mathcal{X})$ and $X \in \mathcal{X}$.

We have the following properties for $\varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$ (and the similar ones for $\varepsilon_n^\vee(\mathcal{X})$).

Proposition 2.2. *Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a triangulated category, $\mathcal{X}$ be a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, and n a natural number. Then, the following statements hold.*

- (a) *For any $Z \in \mathcal{T}$ and $n > 0$, we have that $Z \in \varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$ if and only if there is a family $\{K_j[-1] \to K_{j+1} \to X_j \to K_j\}_{j=0}^{n-1}$ of distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$ with $K_0 = Z$, $X_j \in \mathcal{X}$ and $K_n \in \mathcal{X}$.*
- (b) $\varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X}) = *_{i=0}^{n}\mathcal{X}[i] := \mathcal{X} * \mathcal{X}[1] * \cdots * \mathcal{X}[n]$.
- (c) *If $0 \in \mathcal{X}$ then $\mathcal{X}[n] \subseteq \varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \varepsilon_{n+1}^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$ and $\varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X})[1] \subseteq \varepsilon_{n+1}^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$ $\forall\, n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. (a) If $n = 1$ then the equivalence follows from the definition of $\varepsilon_1^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$. Let $n \geq 2$ and suppose (by induction) that the equivalence is true for $\varepsilon_{n-1}^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$. By definition, $Z \in \varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$ if and only if there is a distinguished triangle in $\mathcal{T}$

$$Z[-1] \longrightarrow K_1 \longrightarrow X_0 \longrightarrow Z$$

with $K_1 \in \varepsilon_{n-1}^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$ and $X_0 \in \mathcal{X}$. On the other hand, by induction, we have that $K_1 \in \varepsilon_{n-1}^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$ if and only if there is a family $\{K_j[-1] \to K_{j+1} \to X_j \to K_j\}_{j=1}^{n-1}$ of distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X_j \in \mathcal{X}$ and $K_n \in \mathcal{X}$; proving (a).

(b) By definition, we have that $\varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{X} * \varepsilon_{n-1}^\wedge(\mathcal{X})[1]$. So, by induction, it follows that $\varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{X} * (*_{i=0}^{n-1}\mathcal{X}[i])[1] = *_{i=0}^{n}\mathcal{X}[i]$.

(c) Assume that $0 \in \mathcal{X}$. By (b), we know that $\varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X}) = \varepsilon_{n-1}^\wedge(\mathcal{X}) * \mathcal{X}[n]$; and since $0 \in \varepsilon_{n-1}^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$, it follows from 1.1 (a) that $\mathcal{X}[n] \subseteq \varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$. Similarly, from the equalities $\varepsilon_{n+1}^\wedge(\mathcal{X}) = \varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X}) * \mathcal{X}[n+1]$ and $\varepsilon_{n+1}^\wedge(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{X} * \varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X})[1]$, and the facts that $0 \in \mathcal{X}[n+1]$ and $0 \in \mathcal{X}$, we get the other inclusions from 1.1 (a). □

Following [2] and [7], we introduce the notion of $\mathcal{X}$-resolution (respectively, coresolution) dimension of any class $\mathcal{Y}$ of objects of $\mathcal{T}$.

Definition 2.3. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$.*

(a) $\mathcal{X}^\wedge := \cup_{n\geq 0}\,\varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$ *and* $\mathcal{X}^\vee := \cup_{n\geq 0}\,\varepsilon_n^\vee(\mathcal{X})$.

(b) *For any $M\in\mathcal{T}$, the $\mathcal{X}$-**resolution dimension** of M is*

$$\operatorname{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) := \min\{n\in\mathbb{N}\ :\ M\in\varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X})\}.$$

*Dually, the $\mathcal{X}$-**coresolution dimension** of M is*

$$\operatorname{coresdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) := \min\{n\in\mathbb{N}:\ M\in\varepsilon_n^\vee(\mathcal{X})\}.$$

(c) *For any subclass $\mathcal{Y}$ of $\mathcal{T}$, we set* $\operatorname{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) := \sup\{\operatorname{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(M)\ :\ M\in\mathcal{Y}\}$. *Similarly, we also have* $\operatorname{coresdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y})$.

Proposition 2.4. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, $0\in\mathcal{Y}$ and $n\in\mathbb{N}$. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) $\operatorname{resdim}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X})\leq n$ *if and only if* $\mathcal{X}\subseteq\varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{Y}) = *_{i=0}^n\,\mathcal{Y}[i]$.

(b) *If $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under extensions, then $\mathcal{X}*\mathcal{X}^\wedge\subseteq\mathcal{X}^\wedge$.*

(c) *If $\mathcal{X}$ is cosuspended, then $\varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{X}[n]$.*

Proof. (a) It follows by definition and 2.2 (b),(c).

(b) It follows from 2.2 (b) since $\mathcal{X}*\mathcal{X}\subseteq\mathcal{X}$.

(c) Let $\mathcal{X}$ be cosuspended. since $0\in\mathcal{X}$ (see 1.1 (b)), we get from 2.2 (b), (c) that $\mathcal{X}[n]\subseteq\varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X}) = *_{i=0}^n\,\mathcal{X}[i]$. On the other hand, using that $\mathcal{X}*\mathcal{X}\subseteq\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{X}[-1]\subseteq\mathcal{X}$, we conclude that $*_{i=0}^n\,\mathcal{X}[i] = (*_{i=0}^n\,\mathcal{X}[i-n])[n]\subseteq(*_{i=0}^n\,\mathcal{X})[n]\subseteq\mathcal{X}[n]$. □

The following result will be useful in this paper. The item (a) already appeared in [7]. We also recall that $\Delta_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X})$ (respectively, $\overline{\Delta}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X})$) stands for the smallest triangulated (respectively, smallest thick) subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ containing the class of objects $\mathcal{X}$.

Theorem 2.5. *For any cosuspended subcategory $\mathcal{X}$ of $\mathcal{T}$ and any object $C\in\mathcal{T}$, the following statements hold.*

(a) $\operatorname{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(C)\leq n$ *if and only if* $C\in\mathcal{X}[n]$.

(b) $\mathcal{X}^\wedge = \cup_{n\geq 0}\,\mathcal{X}[n] = \Delta_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X})$.

(c) *If $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$, then $\mathcal{X}^\wedge = \overline{\Delta}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X})$.*

Proof. (a) If follows from 2.4 (a), (c) since $0\in\mathcal{X}$ (see 1.1 (b)).

(b) From 2.4 (c), we get $\mathcal{X}^\wedge = \cup_{n\geq 0}\,\mathcal{X}[n]$; and hence $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ is closed under positive and negative shifts. We prove now that $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ is closed under extensions. Indeed, let $X[n]\to Y\to X'[m]\to X[n][1]$ be a distinguished triangle in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X, X'\in\mathcal{X}$. We assume that $n\leq m$ and then $X[n] = X[n-m][m]\in\mathcal{X}[m]$ since $n-m\leq 0$ and $\mathcal{X}[-1]\subseteq\mathcal{X}$. Using now that $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under extensions, it follows that $Y\in\mathcal{X}[m]\subseteq\mathcal{X}^\wedge$; proving that $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ is closed under extensions.

Hence $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ is a triangulated subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ and moreover it is the smallest one containing $\mathcal{X}$ since $\mathcal{X}^\wedge = \cup_{n\geq 0}\,\mathcal{X}[n]$.

(c) It follows from (b). □

Remark 2.6. (1) *Observe that a suspended class* $\mathcal{U}$ *of* $\mathcal{T}$ *is closed under cones. Indeed, if* $A \to B \to C \to A[1]$ *is a distinguished triangle in* $\mathcal{T}$ *with* $A, B \in \mathcal{U}$ *then* $A[1], B \in \mathcal{U}$; *and so we get* $C \in \mathcal{U}$. *Similarly, if* $\mathcal{U}$ *is cosuspended then it is closed under cocones.*

(2) *Let* $(\mathcal{Y}, \omega)$ *be a pair of classes of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$ *with* $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$. *If* $\mathcal{Y}$ *is closed under cones (respectively, cocones) then* $\omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$ *(respectively,* $\omega^\vee \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$*). Indeed, assume that* $\mathcal{Y}$ *is closed under cones and let* $M \in \omega^\wedge$. *Thus* $M \in \varepsilon_n^\wedge(\omega)$ *for some* $n \in \mathbb{N}$. *If* $n = 0$ *then* $M \in \omega \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$. *Let* $n > 0$, *and hence there is a distinguished triangle* $M[-1] \to K \to Y \to M$ *in* $\mathcal{T}$ *with* $K \in \varepsilon_{n-1}^\wedge(\omega)$ *and* $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$. *By induction* $K \in \mathcal{Y}$ *and hence* $M \in \mathcal{Y}$ *since* $\mathcal{Y}$ *is closed under cones; proving that* $\omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$.

(3) *Note that* $\mathcal{X}^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}$ *(respectively,* $\mathcal{X}^\vee \subseteq {}_\mathcal{X}\mathcal{U}$*) since* $\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}$ *(respectively,* ${}_\mathcal{X}\mathcal{U}$*) is closed under cones (respectively, cocones) and contains* $\mathcal{X}$.

Using the fact that the functor Hom is a cohomological one, we get the following description of the orthogonal categories. In particular, observe that ${}_\mathcal{X}\mathcal{U}^\perp$ (respectively, ${}^\perp\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}$) is a suspended (respectively, cosuspended) subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$.

Lemma 2.7. *For any class* $\mathcal{X}$ *of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$, *we have that*

(a) ${}^\perp\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X} = \{Z \in \mathcal{T} \ :\ \mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(Z, X[i]) = 0, \quad \forall i \geq 0, \forall X \in \mathcal{X}\}$,

(b) ${}_\mathcal{X}\mathcal{U}^\perp = \{Z \in \mathcal{T} \ :\ \mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(X[i], Z) = 0, \quad \forall i \leq 0, \forall X \in \mathcal{X}\}$.

Proof. It is straightforward. □

Lemma 2.8. *Let* $\mathcal{Y}$ *and* $\mathcal{X}$ *be classes of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$, $n \geq 1$ *and* $Z \in \mathcal{T}$. *The following statements hold.*

(a) *The object* Z *belongs to* $\mathcal{Y} * \mathcal{Y}[1] * \cdots * \mathcal{Y}[n-1] * \mathcal{X}[n]$ *if and only if there exists a family* $\{K_i \to Y_i \to K_{i+1} \to K_i[1] \ :\ Y_i \in \mathcal{Y}\}_{i=0}^{n-1}$ *of distinguished triangles in* $\mathcal{T}$ *with* $K_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ *and* $Z = K_n$.

(b) *The object* Z *belongs to* $\mathcal{X}[-n] * \mathcal{Y}[-n+1] * \cdots * \mathcal{Y}[-1] * \mathcal{Y}$ *if and only if there exists a family* $\{K_{i+1} \to Y_i \to K_i \to K_{i+1}[1] \ :\ Y_i \in \mathcal{Y}\}_{i=0}^{n-1}$ *of distinguished triangles in* $\mathcal{T}$ *with* $K_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ *and* $Z = K_n$.

Proof. (a) We proceed by induction on n. If $n = 1$ then (a) is trivial. Suppose that $n \geq 2$ and consider the class

$$\mathcal{Z}_{n-1} := \mathcal{Y} * \mathcal{Y}[1] * \cdots * \mathcal{Y}[n-2] * \mathcal{X}[n-1].$$

It is clear that $\mathcal{Y} * \mathcal{Y}[1] * \cdots * \mathcal{Y}[n-1] * \mathcal{X}[n] = \mathcal{Y} * \mathcal{Z}_{n-1}[1]$; and then, we have that $Z \in \mathcal{Y} * \mathcal{Y}[1] * \cdots * \mathcal{Y}[n-1] * \mathcal{X}[n]$ if and only if there is a distinguished triangle

$$K \longrightarrow Y \longrightarrow Z \longrightarrow K[1]$$

in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $K \in \mathcal{Z}_{n-1}$. On the other hand, by induction, we have that $K \in \mathcal{Z}_{n-1}$ if and only if there is a family $\{K_i \to Y_i \to K_{i+1} \to K_i[1] \, : \, Y_i \in \mathcal{Y}\}_{i=0}^{n-2}$ of distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$ with $K_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $K = K_{n-1}$. So the result follows by adding the triangle above to the preceding family of triangles.

(b) It is similar to (a). □

3. Relative homological dimensions

In this section, we introduce the $\mathcal{X}$-projective (respectively, injective) dimension of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. Moreover, we establish a result that relates this relative projective dimension with the resolution dimension as can be seen in Theorem 3.4.

Definition 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ and M an object in $\mathcal{T}$.*

(a) *The **$\mathcal{X}$-projective dimension** of M is*

$$\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) := \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \, : \, \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(M[-i], -)\,|_{\mathcal{X}} = 0, \quad \forall i > n\}.$$

(b) *The **$\mathcal{X}$-injective dimension** of M is*

$$\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) := \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \, : \, \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(-, M[i])\,|_{\mathcal{X}} = 0, \quad \forall i > n\}.$$

(c) *For any class $\mathcal{Y}$ of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, we set*

$$\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) := \sup\{\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) \, : \, C \in \mathcal{Y}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) := \sup\{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) \, : \, C \in \mathcal{Y}\}.$$

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) *For any $M \in \mathcal{T}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have that*
  (a1) *$\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) \leq n$ if and only if $M \in {}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}[n+1]$;*
  (a2) *$\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) \leq n$ if and only if $M \in {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-n-1]$.*

(b) *$\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X}) = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y})$ for any class $\mathcal{Y}$ of objects in $\mathcal{T}$.*

Proof. (a) follows from 2.7, and (b) is straightforward. □

Proposition 3.3. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ and $M \in \mathcal{T}$. Then*

$$\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) = \mathrm{resdim}_{{}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}[1]}(M) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) = \mathrm{coresdim}_{{}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1]}(M).$$

Proof. Since ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is cosuspended (see 2.7 (a)), the first equality follows from 3.2 (a1) and 2.5 (a). The second equality can be proven similarly. □

Now, we prove the following relationship between the relative projective dimension and the resolution dimension.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) \leq \mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) + \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{Y}}(L), \quad \forall L \in \mathcal{T}.$

(b) *If* $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}} \cap {}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}[1]$ *and* $\mathcal{Y}$ *is closed under direct summands in* $\mathcal{T}$*, then*

$$\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) = \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{Y}}(L), \quad \forall L \in \mathcal{Y}^{\wedge}.$$

Proof. (a) Let $d := \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{Y}}(L)$ and $\alpha := \mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y})$. We may assume that d and α are finite. We prove (a) by induction on d. If $d = 0$, it follows that $L \in \mathcal{Y}$ and then (a) holds in this case.
Assume that $d \geq 1$. So we have a distinguished triangle $K \to Y \to L \to K[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $K \in \varepsilon^{\wedge}_{d-1}(\mathcal{Y})$. Applying the cohomological functor $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(-, M[j])$, with $M \in \mathcal{X}$, to the above triangle, we get and exact sequence of abelian groups

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(K[1], M[j]) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(L, M[j]) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(Y, M[j]).$$

By induction, we know that $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(K) \leq \alpha + d - 1$. Therefore $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(L, M[j]) = 0$ for $j > \alpha + d$ and so $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) \leq \alpha + d$.

(b) Let $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}} \cap^{\perp} \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}[1]$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$. Consider $L \in \mathcal{Y}^{\wedge}$ and let $d := \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{Y}}(L)$. By 3.2 we have that $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) = 0$ and then $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) \leq d$ (see (a)). We prove, by induction on d, that the equality given in (b) holds. For $d = 0$ it is clear.
Suppose that $d = 1$. Then, there is a distinguished triangle

$$\eta: \quad Y_1 \to Y_0 \to L \xrightarrow{f} Y_1[1] \text{ in } \mathcal{T} \text{ with } Y_i \in \mathcal{Y}.$$

If $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) = 0$ then $L \in {}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}[1]$ (see 3.2). Hence $f = 0$ since $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$; and therefore η splits giving us that $L \in \mathcal{Y}$, which is a contradiction since $d = 1$. So $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) > 0$ proving (b) for $d = 1$.
Assume now that $d \geq 2$. Thus we have a distinguished triangle $K \to Y \to L \to K[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, $K \in \varepsilon^{\wedge}_{d-1}(\mathcal{Y})$ and $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(K) = d - 1$ (by inductive hypothesis). Since $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) \leq d$, it is enough to see $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) > d - 1$. So, in case $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) \leq d - 1$, we apply the cohomological functor $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(-, X[d])$, with $X \in \mathcal{X}$, to the triangle $L \to K[1] \to Y[1] \to L[1]$. Then we get the following exact sequence of abelian groups

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(Y[1], X[d]) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(K[1], X[d]) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(L, X[d]).$$

Therefore $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(K[1], X[d]) = 0$ contradicting that $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(K) = d - 1$. This means that $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) > d - 1$; proving (b). □

Remark 3.5. *Note that if* $Y \neq 0$ *and* $Y \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}} \cap {}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}[1]$*, then* $Y[j] \notin \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}} \cap {}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}[1]$, $\forall j > 0$.

The following technical result will be used in Section 4.

Lemma 3.6. *Let* $\mathcal{X}$*,* $\mathcal{Y}$ *and* $\mathcal{Z}$ *be classes of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$*. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee}) = \mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X})$.

(b) *If* $\mathcal{X}\subseteq\mathcal{Z}\subseteq\mathcal{X}^\vee$ *then* $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{Z})=\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X})$.

Proof. To prove (a), it is enough to see that $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X}^\vee)\leq\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X})$. Let $M\in\mathcal{X}^\vee$. We prove by induction on $d:=\mathrm{coresdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(M)$ that $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(M)\leq\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X})$. We may assume that $\alpha:=\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X})<\infty$. If $d=0$ then we have that $M\in\mathcal{X}$ and there is nothing to prove.

Let $d\geq 1$. Then we have a distinguished triangle $M\to X\to K\to M[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X\in\mathcal{X}$, $K\in\varepsilon^\vee_{d-1}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(K)\leq\alpha$ (by inductive hypothesis). Applying the cohomological functor $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(-,Y[i])$, with $Y\in\mathcal{Y}$, we get the exact sequence of abelian groups

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X,Y[i])\to\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(M,Y[i])\to\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(K,Y[i+1]).$$

Therefore $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(M,Y[i])=0$ for $i>\alpha$ since $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(K)\leq\alpha$. So we get that $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X}^\vee)\leq\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X})$.

Finally, it is easy to see that (b) is a consequence of (a). □

The following two lemmas resembles the so called "shifting argument" that is usually used for syzygies and cosyzygies in the Ext^n functor.

Lemma 3.7. *Let* $\mathcal{X}$ *and* $\mathcal{Y}$ *be classes of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$ *such that* $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y})=0$. *Then, for any* $X\in\mathcal{X}$, $k>0$ *and* $K_n\in\mathcal{Y}*\mathcal{Y}[1]*\cdots*\mathcal{Y}[n-1]*K_0[n]$, *there is an isomorphism of abelian groups*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X,K_0[k+n])\simeq\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X,K_n[k]).$$

Proof. Let $X\in\mathcal{X}$, $k>0$ and $K_n\in\mathcal{Y}*\mathcal{Y}[1]*\cdots*\mathcal{Y}[n-1]*K_0[n]$. By 2.8 (a), we have distinguished triangles $\eta_i:\quad K_i\to Y_i\to K_{i+1}\to K_i[1]$ with $Y_i\in\mathcal{Y},\ 0\leq i\leq n-1$. Applying the functor $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X[-k],-)$ to η_i, we get the exact sequence of abelian groups

$$(X[-k],Y_i)\to(X[-k],K_{i+1})\to(X[-k],K_i[1])\to(X[-k],Y_i[1]),$$

where $(-,-):=\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(-,-)$ for simplicity. Since $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y})=0$, it follows that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X[-k],K_{i+1})\simeq\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X[-k],K_i[1])$. Therefore, by the preceding isomorphism, we have
$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X,K_n[k])\simeq\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X,K_{n-1}[k+1])\simeq\cdots\simeq\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X,K_0[k+n])$. □

Lemma 3.8. *Let* $\mathcal{X}$ *and* $\mathcal{Y}$ *be classes of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$ *such that* $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y})=0$. *Then, for any* $X\in\mathcal{X}$, $k>0$ *and* $K_n\in K_0[-n]*\mathcal{Y}[-n+1]*\cdots*\mathcal{Y}[-1]*\mathcal{Y}$, *there is an isomorphism of abelian groups*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(K_0,X[k+n])\simeq\mathrm{Hom}_{T}(K_n,X[k]).$$

Proof. The proof is similar to the one given in 3.7 by using 2.8 (b). □

4. RELATIVE WEAK-COGENERATORS AND RELATIVE INJECTIVES

In this section, we focus our attention on pairs $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. We study the relationship between weak-cogenerators in $\mathcal{X}$ and coresolutions. Also, we give a characterization of some special subcategories of $\mathcal{T}$.

Definition 4.1. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. We say that*

(a) *ω is a* **weak-cogenerator** *in $\mathcal{X}$, if $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{X}[-1] * \omega$;*
(b) *ω is a* **weak-generator** *in $\mathcal{X}$, if $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{X} \subseteq \omega * \mathcal{X}[1]$;*
(c) *ω is* **$\mathcal{X}$-injective** *if $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega) = 0$; and dually, ω is* **$\mathcal{X}$-projective** *if $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega) = 0$.*

The following result say us that an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator, closed under direct summands, is unique (in case it exists).

Proposition 4.2. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ such that ω is $\mathcal{X}$-injective. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) *$\omega^\wedge$ is $\mathcal{X}$-injective.*
(b) *If ω is a weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$, and ω is closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$, then*

$$\omega = \mathcal{X} \cap {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1] = \mathcal{X} \cap \omega^\wedge.$$

Proof. (a) It follows from the dual result of 3.6 (a).

(b) Let $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{X}[-1] * \omega$ and ω be closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$.

We start by proving the first equality. Let $X \in \mathcal{X} \cap {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1]$. Since $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{X}[-1] * \omega$, there is a distinguished triangle

$$\eta : \quad X \to W \to X' \xrightarrow{f} X[1] \text{ in } \mathcal{T} \text{ with } X' \in \mathcal{X} \text{ and } W \in \omega.$$

Moreover $X \in {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1]$ implies that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(-, X[1])|_{\mathcal{X}} = 0$ (see 2.7 (b)). Hence η splits and so $X \in \omega$; proving that $\mathcal{X} \cap {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1] \subseteq \omega$. The other inclusion follows from 3.2 (a2) since $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega) = 0$.
On the other hand, it is easy to see that $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{X} \cap \omega^\wedge$ and since $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega^\wedge) = 0$, it follows from 3.2 (a2) that $\mathcal{X} \cap \omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X} \cap {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1]$; proving (b). □

Proposition 4.3. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, and ω be closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$. If ω is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$, then*

$$\mathcal{X} \cap \omega^\vee = \{X \in \mathcal{X} \, : \, \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(X) < \infty\}.$$

Proof. Let $M \in \mathcal{X} \cap \omega^\vee$. We assert that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) \leq d < \infty$ where $d := \mathrm{coresdim}_{\omega}(M)$. Indeed, from 2.2 (a), dual version, and 2.8 (a), there is some $W_d \in \omega * \omega[1] * \cdots * \omega[d-1] * M[d]$ with $W_d \in \omega$. So, by 3.7 we get an isomorphism $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X, M[k+d]) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X, W_d[k])$ for any $k > 0$ and $X \in \mathcal{X}$; and using that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega) = 0$, it follows that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X, M[k+d]) = 0$ for any $k > 0$, proving that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) \leq d$.

Let $N \in \mathcal{X}$ be such that $n := \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(N) < \infty$. Using that $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{X}[-1] * \omega$, we can construct a family $\{K_i \to W_i \to K_{i+1} \to K_i[1] \ : \ W_i \in \omega, \ 0 \leq i \leq n-1\}$ of distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$ where $K_0 := N$ and $K_i \in \mathcal{X}$, $\forall i \ 0 \leq i \leq n$. Thus, by 2.8 (a), it follows that $K_n \in \omega * \omega[1] * \cdots * \omega[n-1] * N[n]$; and so by 3.7 we get that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X, K_n[k]) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X, N[k+n])$, $\forall X \in \mathcal{X}$, $\forall k > 0$. But $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X, N[k+n]) = 0$, $\forall X \in \mathcal{X}$, $\forall k > 0$ because $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(N) = n$. Therefore $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(K_n) = 0$ and then $K_n \in \omega$ (see 3.2 and 4.2 (b)); proving that $N \in \mathcal{X} \cap \omega^{\vee}$. □

Now, we are in condition to prove the following result. In the statement, we use the notions of precovering and preenveloping classes (see Section 1).

Theorem 4.4. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, $\mathcal{X}$ be closed under extensions and ω be a weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) *For all $C \in \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ there exist two distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$:*
$C[-1] \longrightarrow Y_C \longrightarrow X_C \xrightarrow{\varphi_C} C$ *with $Y_C \in \omega^{\wedge}$ and $X_C \in \mathcal{X}$,*
$C \xrightarrow{\varphi^C} Y^C \longrightarrow X^C \longrightarrow C[1]$ *with $Y^C \in \omega^{\wedge}$ and $X^C \in \mathcal{X}$.*

(b) *If ω is $\mathcal{X}$-injective, then*

  (b1) *$Y_C[1] \in \mathcal{X}^{\perp}$ and φ_C is an $\mathcal{X}$-precover of C,*

  (b2) *$X^C[-1] \in {}^{\perp}(\omega^{\wedge})$ and φ^C is a $\omega^{\wedge}$-preenvelope of C.*

Proof. (a) Let $C \in \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$. We prove the existence of the triangles in (a) by induction on $n := \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(C)$. If $n = 0$, we have that $C \in \mathcal{X}$ and then we can consider $C[-1] \to 0 \to C \overset{1_C}{\to} C$ as the first triangle; the second one can be obtained from the fact that $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{X}[-1] * \omega$.

Assume that $n > 0$. Then, we have a distinguished triangle $C[-1] \to K_1 \to X_0 \to C$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(K_1) = n-1$. Hence, by induction, there is a distinguished triangle $K_1 \to Y^{K_1} \to X^{K_1} \to K_1[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y^{K_1} \in \omega^{\wedge}$ and $X^{K_1} \in \mathcal{X}$. By the co-base change procedure applied to the above triangles, there exists a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & X^{K_1}[-1] \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d] & X^{K_1}[-1] \arrow[d] & \\
C[-1] \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & K_1 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & X_0 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & C \arrow[d, equal] \\
C[-1] \arrow[r] & Y^{K_1} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & U \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & C \\
 & X^{K_1} \arrow[r, equal] & X^{K_1} &
\end{tikzcd}$$

where the rows and columns are distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$. Since $X_0, X^{K_1} \in \mathcal{X}$ it follows that $U \in \mathcal{X}$. By taking $X_C := U$ and $Y_C := Y^{K_1}$, we get the first triangle in (a). On the other hand, since $U \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{X}[-1] * \omega$, there exists a distinguished triangle $X^C[-1] \to U \to W \to X^C$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X^C \in \mathcal{X}$ and $W \in \omega$. Again, by the co-base change procedure, there exists a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & Y^{K_1} \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d] & Y^{K_1} \arrow[d] & \\
X^C[-1] \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & U \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & W \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & X^C \arrow[d, equal] \\
X^C[-1] \arrow[r] & C \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & Y^C \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & X^C \\
 & Y^{K_1}[1] \arrow[r, equal] & Y^{K_1}[1] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

where the rows and columns are distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$. By the second column, in the diagram above, it follows that $Y^C \in \omega^\wedge$. Hence the second row in the preceding diagram is the desired triangle.

(b2) Consider the triangle $X^C[-1] \xrightarrow{g} C \xrightarrow{\varphi^C} Y^C \to X^C$ with $Y^C \in \omega^\wedge$ and $X^C \in \mathcal{X}$. Since $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega) = 0$ we have by 4.2 that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega^\wedge) = 0$. Thus $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X[-1], -)|_{\omega^\wedge} = 0$ for any $X \in \mathcal{X}$; and so $X^C[-1] \in {}^{\perp}(\omega^\wedge)$. Let $f : C \to Y$ be a morphism in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y \in \omega^\wedge$. Since $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X^C[-1], Y) = 0$, we have that $fg = 0$ and hence f factors through φ^C; proving that φ^C is a $\omega^\wedge$-preenvelope of C.

(b1) It is similar to the proof of (b2). □

The following result provides a characterization of the category $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$, and will be applied in [15] to deal with co-t-structures.

Corollary 4.5. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ such that $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under extensions and ω is a weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) *If $0 \in \omega$ then $\mathcal{X}^\wedge = \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge = \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge[1]$.*

(b) *If $\mathcal{X}[-1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ then $\mathcal{X}^\wedge = \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge = \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge[1] = \mathcal{X}[-1] * \omega^\wedge$.*

Proof. We assert that $\mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge$. Indeed, since $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ it follows from 2.2 (b) that $\varepsilon_n^\wedge(\omega) \subseteq \varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$, giving us that $\omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge$. Hence $\mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \mathcal{X}^\wedge$ and then $\mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge$ by 2.4 (b).

(a) Let $0 \in \omega$. By 4.4 (a) we have that $\mathcal{X}^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge[1]$, and therefore, by 2.2 (d) we get $\mathcal{X}^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge[1] \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge$. But $\mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \mathcal{X}^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge$ by 2.4 (b), and then $\mathcal{X}^\wedge = \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge = \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge[1]$.

(b) Let $\mathcal{X}[-1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. By 4.4 (a) and the assertion above, we have $\mathcal{X}^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X}[-1] * \omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge$. On the other hand, from 4.4 (a), it follows that $\mathcal{X}^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge[1]$. So, to prove (b), it is enough to see that $\mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge[1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge$. Let $C \in \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge[1]$. Then there is a distinguished triangle $Y \to X \to C \to Y[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $Y \in \omega^\wedge$. Hence it follows that $C \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge$ since $\omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge$; proving (b). $\square$

We are now in position to prove that if ω is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator in a suitable class $\mathcal{X}$, then the $\omega^\wedge$-projective dimension coincides with the $\mathcal{X}$-resolution dimension for every object of the thick subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ generated by $\mathcal{X}$.

Theorem 4.6. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ which are closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$. If $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under extensions and ω is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$, then*

$$\mathrm{pd}_{\omega^\wedge}(C) = \mathrm{pd}_{\omega}(C) = \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(C), \quad \forall C \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge.$$

Proof. Let $C \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge$. By 3.2 (b) and the dual of 3.6 (a), it follows that $\mathrm{pd}_{\omega}(C) = \mathrm{id}_{\{C\}}(\omega) = \mathrm{id}_{\{C\}}(\omega^\wedge) = \mathrm{pd}_{\omega^\wedge}(C)$. To prove the last equality, we proceed by induction on $n := \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(C)$. To start with, we have $\mathrm{pd}_{\omega}(\mathcal{X}) = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega) = 0$. If $n = 0$ then $C \in \mathcal{X}$ and so $\mathrm{pd}_{\omega}(C) = 0 = \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(C)$.

Let $n = 1$. Then, we have a distinguished triangle $X_1 \to X_0 \to C \to X_1[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X_i \in \mathcal{X}$. By 4.4 (a), there is a distinguished triangle $Y_C \to X_C \overset{\varphi_C}{\to} C \to Y_C[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y_C \in \omega^\wedge$ and $X_C \in \mathcal{X}$. By the base change procedure, there exists a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & Y_C \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d] & Y_C \arrow[d] & \\
X_1 \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & E \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & X_C \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\varphi_C"'] & X_1[1] \arrow[d, equal] \\
X_1 \arrow[r] & X_0 \arrow[r, "\alpha"] \arrow[d] & C \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\beta"'] & X_1[1] \\
 & Y_C[1] \arrow[r, equal] & Y_C[1], &
\end{tikzcd}$$

where the rows and columns are distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$. Since $X_1, X_C \in \mathcal{X}$ it follows that $E \in \mathcal{X}$. On the other hand, since $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X, Y[1]) = 0$ for any $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $Y \in \omega^\wedge$ (see 4.2 (a)), we get that $\beta\alpha = 0$ and then the triangle

$Y_C \to E \to X_0 \to Y_C[1]$ splits getting us that $Y_C \in \mathcal{X} \cap \omega^\wedge = \omega$ (see 4.2). Using that $\mathrm{pd}_\omega(\mathcal{X}) = 0$ and 3.4 (a), we have that $\mathrm{pd}_\omega(C) \leq \mathrm{resdim}_\mathcal{X}(C) = 1$. We assert that $\mathrm{pd}_\omega(C) > 0$. Indeed, suppose that $\mathrm{pd}_\omega(C) = 0$; and then $\mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(C, W[1]) = 0$ for any $W \in \omega$. Since $Y_C \in \omega$ we get that $\beta = 0$ and hence the triangle $Y_C \to X_C \to C \to Y_C[1]$ splits. Therefore $C \in \mathcal{X}$ contradicting that $\mathrm{resdim}_\mathcal{X}(C) = 1$; proving that $\mathrm{pd}_\omega(C) = 1 = \mathrm{resdim}_\mathcal{X}(C)$.

Let $n \geq 2$. From 3.4 (a), we have that $\mathrm{pd}_\omega(C) \leq \mathrm{resdim}_\mathcal{X}(C) = n$ since $\mathrm{pd}_\omega(\mathcal{X}) = 0$. Then, it is enough to prove that $\mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(C[-n], -)|_\omega \neq 0$. Consider a distinguished triangle $K_1 \to X_0 \to C \to K_1[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathrm{resdim}_\mathcal{X}(K_1) = n-1 = \mathrm{pd}_\omega(K_1)$. Applying the functor $\mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(-, W[n])$, with $W \in \omega$, to the triangle $C \to K_1[1] \to X_0[1] \to C[1]$ we get the exact sequence of abelian groups

$$\mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(X_0[1], W[n]) \to \mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(K_1[1], W[n]) \to \mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(C, W[n]).$$

Suppose that $\mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(C[-n], -)|_\omega = 0$. Then $\mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(K_1[1], W[n]) = 0$ since $\mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(\omega) = 0$ and $n \geq 2$; contradicting that $\mathrm{pd}_\omega(K_1) = n - 1$. □

Lemma 4.7. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ and $A \to B \to C \to A[1]$ a distinguished triangle in $\mathcal{T}$. Then*

(a) $\mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(B) \leq \max\{\mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(A), \mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(C)\}$;

(b) $\mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(A) \leq \max\{\mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(B), \mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(C) + 1\}$;

(c) $\mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(C) \leq \max\{\mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(B), \mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(A) - 1\}$.

Proof. It is straightforward. □

The following result gives a relationship between the relative injective dimensions, attached to the pair $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$, and the ω-coresolution dimension. Such a result will be applied in [15] to deal with co-t-structures. Observe that 4.8 is not the dual version of 4.6.

Proposition 4.8. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ such that $\omega \subseteq {}_\mathcal{X}\mathcal{U}$. If ω is closed under direct summands and $\mathcal{X}$-injective, then*

$$\mathrm{id}_\omega(C) = \mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(C) = \mathrm{coresdim}_\omega(C), \quad \forall\, C \in {}_\mathcal{X}\mathcal{U} \cap \omega^\vee.$$

Proof. Assume that ω is closed under direct summands and $\mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(\omega) = 0$. Let $C \in {}_\mathcal{X}\mathcal{U} \cap \omega^\vee$ and $n := \mathrm{coresdim}_\omega(C)$. By the dual of 3.4 (b), it follows

$$(*) \quad \alpha := \mathrm{id}_\omega(C) \leq \mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(C) = \mathrm{coresdim}_\omega(C) = n.$$

Moreover, since $C \in \omega^\vee$ there is a distinguished triangle $(\eta)\ :\ C \to W_0 \to K_1 \to C[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $W_0 \in \omega$ and $\mathrm{coresdim}_\omega(K_1) = n-1$. Furthermore, from 2.2 (a) we get that $K_1 \in {}_\mathcal{X}\mathcal{U}$ since ${}_\mathcal{X}\mathcal{U}$ is closed under cocones and $\omega \subseteq {}_\mathcal{X}\mathcal{U}$. Now, we prove the result by induction on α.

Let $\alpha = 0$. We assert that $C \in \omega$ (note that if this is true, then the result follows). We proceed by induction on n. If $n = 0$ it is clear that $C \in \omega$. So we may assume that $n > 0$, and then, applying 4.7 to (η) it follows that $\mathrm{id}_\omega(K_1) = 0$. Hence by induction we get that $K_1 \in \omega$, and so $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(K_1, C[1]) = 0$ since $\mathrm{id}_\omega(C) = 0$. Therefore the triangle (η) splits and then $C \in \omega$; proving the assertion.

Assume that $\alpha > 0$. Applying 4.7 to (η), we get that $\mathrm{id}_\omega(K_1) \leq \alpha - 1$. Thus, by induction, it follows that $\mathrm{id}_\omega(K_1) = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(K_1) = \mathrm{coresdim}_\omega(K_1) = n-1$. In particular, we obtain that $n - 1 \leq \alpha - 1$ and hence by $(*)$ the result follows. □

The following result provides a characterization of $\omega^\wedge$ in terms of $\mathcal{X}$. From this, we get some nice relationship between other subcategories.

Proposition 4.9. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ such that ω is closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$, $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under extensions and ω is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) ${}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1] \cap \mathcal{X}^\wedge = \omega^\wedge$.

(b) *If* $\mathcal{X}[-1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ *then* $\mathcal{U}_\omega = \omega^\wedge = \mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1] \cap \mathcal{X}^\wedge$.

Proof. (a) Let $C \in {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1] \cap \mathcal{X}^\wedge$. In particular, from 4.4 (a), there exists a distinguished triangle $Y_C \to X_C \to C \to Y_C[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y_C \in \omega^\wedge$ and $X_C \in \mathcal{X}$. We assert that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(X_C) = 0$. Indeed, it follows from 4.7 (a) since $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) = 0 = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(Y_C)$ (see 3.2 and 4.2 (a)). Therefore, $X_C \in \mathcal{X} \cap {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1]$ and by 4.2 (b), we get that $X_C \in \omega$ proving that $C \in \omega^\wedge$. On the other hand, since $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega^\wedge) = 0$, we have from 3.2 that $\omega^\wedge \subseteq {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1] \cap \mathcal{X}^\wedge$.

(b) Assume that $\mathcal{X}[-1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. Hence, by 1.1 (b), we have that $\mathcal{X}$ is a cosuspended subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$. Therefore, from (a), it follows that $\omega^\wedge = \mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1] \cap \mathcal{X}^\wedge$. Furthermore, since $\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1]$ is suspended and $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ is triangulated (see 2.5), we conclude that $\omega^\wedge$ is a suspended subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$; and so $\mathcal{U}_\omega \subseteq \omega^\wedge$. Finally, the equality $\mathcal{U}_\omega = \omega^\wedge$ follows from 2.6 (3). □

Theorem 4.10. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ which are closed under direct summands, $\mathcal{X}$ be cosuspended and ω be an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$. Then,*

$$\varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{X}[n] = \mathcal{X}^\wedge \cap {}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_\omega[n+1] = \mathcal{X}^\wedge \cap {}^{\perp}(\omega^\wedge)[n+1], \quad \forall n \geq 0.$$

Proof. From 2.5, we have that $\varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{X}[n]$ and $\mathcal{X}^\wedge = \cup_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{X}[n]$. On the other hand, by 3.2 and 4.6, it follows that

$$\mathcal{X}^\wedge \cap {}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\omega^\wedge}[n+1] = \mathcal{X}^\wedge \cap {}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_\omega[n+1] = \mathcal{X}[n] \cap \mathcal{X}^\wedge = \mathcal{X}[n].$$

Finally, since $\omega^\wedge$ is a suspended subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ (see 4.9 (b)), we have that ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\omega^\wedge} = {}^{\perp}(\omega^\wedge)$; proving the result. □

The previous results can be seen under the light of the so called torsion theories, in the sense of Iyama-Yoshino. Such torsion theories have been extensively studied in relation to the cluster theory (see [11]).

Definition 4.11. [11, Definition 2.2] *A pair* $(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y})$ *of subcategories of* $\mathcal{T}$ *is called a torsion theory in* $\mathcal{T}$, *if the following conditions hold.*

(a) $\mathcal{X}$ *and* $\mathcal{Y}$ *are closed under direct summands in* $\mathcal{T}$.
(b) $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y})=0$.
(c) $\mathcal{T}=\mathcal{X}*\mathcal{Y}$.

Corollary 4.12. *Let* $(\mathcal{X},\omega)$ *be a pair of classes of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$, *which are closed under direct summands in* $\mathcal{T}$, *and such that* $\mathcal{X}$ *is cosuspended and* ω *is an* $\mathcal{X}$*-injective weak-cogenerator in* $\mathcal{X}$. *Then, the pair* $(\mathcal{X},\omega^\wedge[1])$ *is a torsion theory in the thick triangulated subcategory* $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ *of* $\mathcal{T}$.

Proof. Since $\mathcal{X}$ is cosuspended and closed under direct summands, we know from 2.5 (c) that $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ is a thick triangulated subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$. On the other hand, from 4.5, it follows that $\mathcal{X}^\wedge=\mathcal{X}*\omega^\wedge[1]$; and furthermore, $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X},\omega^\wedge[1])=0$ since ω is $\mathcal{X}$-injective. On the other hand, by 4.9, we get that $\omega^\wedge$ is a subcategory closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$. □

Definition 4.13. *For a given class* $\mathcal{Y}$ *of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$, *we set* $\mathcal{Y}^\sim:=(\mathcal{Y}^\wedge)^\vee$.

Lemma 4.14. *Let* $\mathcal{X}$ *be a class of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$. *Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) *If* $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ *is closed under cocones then* $\omega^\sim\subseteq\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ *for any* $\omega\subseteq\mathcal{X}$.

(b) $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ *is closed under cocones if and only if* $\mathcal{X}^\wedge=\mathcal{X}^\sim$.

(c) *If* $\mathcal{X}^\wedge=\mathcal{X}^\sim$ *then* $\mathcal{X}^\wedge[-1]\subseteq\mathcal{X}^\wedge$.

Proof. (a) Let $\omega\subseteq\mathcal{X}$ and assume that $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ is closed under cocones. Hence $\omega^\wedge\subseteq\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ and so by 2.6 (2), we conclude that $\omega^\sim\subseteq\mathcal{X}^\wedge$.

(b) Assume that $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ is closed under cocones. It is clear that $\mathcal{X}^\wedge\subseteq\mathcal{X}^\sim$. On the other hand, by (a) it follows that $\mathcal{X}^\sim\subseteq\mathcal{X}^\wedge$.

Suppose that $\mathcal{X}^\wedge=\mathcal{X}^\sim$. Let $A\to B\to C\to A[1]$ be a distinguished triangle in $\mathcal{T}$ with B,C in $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$. Then $A\in\mathcal{X}^\sim=\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ and so $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ is closed under cocones.

(c) Let $\mathcal{X}^\wedge=\mathcal{X}^\sim$ and consider $X\in\mathcal{X}^\wedge$. Since, we have the distinguished triangle $X[-1]\to 0\to X\xrightarrow{1_X}X$ and $0,X\in\mathcal{X}^\wedge$, it follows from (b) that $X[-1]\in\mathcal{X}^\wedge$; proving the lemma. □

Corollary 4.15. *Let* $(\mathcal{X},\omega)$ *be a pair of classes of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$. *If* $\mathcal{X}$ *is cosuspended and* $\omega\subseteq\mathcal{X}$, *then* $\omega^\sim\subseteq\mathcal{X}^\wedge=\mathcal{X}^\sim$.

Proof. It follows from 4.14 and the fact that $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ is triangulated (see 2.5). □

In case ω is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator in a cosuspended subcategory $\mathcal{X}$ of $\mathcal{T}$, both closed under direct summands, the thick subcategory $\overline{\Delta}_{\mathcal{T}}(\omega)$ of $\mathcal{T}$ can be characterized as follows.

Theorem 4.16. *Let $(\mathcal{X},\omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, $\mathcal{X}$ be cosuspended and ω be closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$. If ω is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$, the following statements hold.*

(a) $\omega^{\sim}=\{C\in\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}:\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C)<\infty\}=\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}\cap(\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1])^{\vee}$.

(b) $\omega^{\sim}$ *is the smallest triangulated subcategory of* $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ *containing* ω, *that is* $\omega^{\sim}=\Delta_{\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}}(\omega)$.

(c) *If* $\mathcal{X}$ *is closed under direct summands in* $\mathcal{T}$, *then*

$$\overline{\Delta}_{\mathcal{T}}(\omega)=\omega^{\sim}=\overline{\Delta}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X})\cap(\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1])^{\vee}.$$

Proof. Assume that $\omega\subseteq\mathcal{X}\subseteq\mathcal{X}[-1]*\omega$ and $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega)=0$. Let $\mathcal{Y}:=\{C\in\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}:\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C)<\infty\}$. We start by proving that $\omega^{\sim}\subseteq\mathcal{Y}$. By 4.15, we know that $\omega^{\sim}\subseteq\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$. On the other hand, since $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega^{\wedge})=0$ (see 4.2(a)), we can apply the dual of 3.4(a), and then $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C)\leq\mathrm{coresdim}_{\omega^{\wedge}}(C)<\infty$ for any $C\in\omega^{\sim}$; proving that $\omega^{\sim}\subseteq\mathcal{Y}$.
Let $C\in\mathcal{Y}$. By 4.4 (a), there is a distinguished triangle $C\to Y^{C}\to X^{C}\to C[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y^{C}\in\omega^{\wedge}$ and $X^{C}\in\mathcal{X}$. Hence, from 4.7 (c) we get that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(X^{C})<\infty$ and then, by 4.3 $X^{C}\in\omega^{\vee}\subseteq\omega^{\sim}$; proving that $C\in\omega^{\sim}$. Hence $\mathcal{Y}\subseteq\omega^{\sim}$. In order to get the second equality in (a), we use 3.2 and the fact that $\mathcal{X}={}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}$ to obtain

$$\{C\in\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}:\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C)<\infty\}=\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}\cap(\cup_{n\geq 0}\,\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-n-1]).$$

On the other hand, since $\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1]$ is suspended, then by the dual of 2.5, it follows that $(\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1])^{\vee}=\cup_{n\geq 0}\,\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-n-1]$ and also that $(\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1])^{\vee}$ is a thick subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$. In particular, by 2.5, we get (b). Finally, (c) follows from (a) and 2.5. □

The following result will be applied in [15] to deal with co-t-structures. Also, it will be applied in Section 5, to get some connection with relative Rouquier's dimension.

Proposition 4.17. *Let $(\mathcal{X},\omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, $\mathcal{X}$ co-suspended and ω closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$. If ω is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$, then*

(a) $\mathrm{id}_{\omega}(C)=\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C)<\infty,\quad\forall C\in\omega^{\sim}$;

(b) $\omega^{\sim}\cap{}_{\omega}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-n-1]=\omega^{\sim}\cap\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-n-1],\quad\forall n\geq 0$.

Proof. (a) By 2.5 and 4.16, we know that $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ and $\omega^{\sim}$ are triangulated subcategories of $\mathcal{T}$. Furthermore, from 4.15 it follows that $\omega^{\sim}\subseteq\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$. Let $C\in\omega^{\sim}$. It is enough to prove that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C)\leq\mathrm{id}_{\omega}(C)$. In order to do that, we will use induction on $n:=\mathrm{id}_{\omega}(C)$.

Since $C\in\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$, we have from 4.4 the existence of a distinguished triangle $(\eta)\ :\ C\to Y^{C}\to X^{C}\to C[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y^{C}\in\omega^{\wedge}\subseteq\omega^{\sim}$ and $X^{C}\in\mathcal{X}$. We assert that $X^{C}\in\mathcal{X}\cap\omega^{\vee}$. Indeed, using that $\omega^{\sim}$ is triangulated we conclude that $X^C \in \mathcal{X} \cap \omega^{\sim}$ and hence $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(X^C)$ is finite (see 4.16 (a)). Thus $X^C \in \mathcal{X} \cap \omega^{\vee}$ by 4.3; proving the assertion.

Let $n = 0$. Then $\mathrm{id}_\omega(X^C) = 0$ since $\mathrm{id}_\omega(Y^C) = 0$ (see 4.2 and 4.7). On the other hand, 4.8 gives the equalities $\mathrm{coresdim}_\omega(X^C) = \mathrm{id}_\omega(X^C) = 0$. Hence $X^C \in \omega$ and since $\mathrm{id}_\omega(C) = 0$, it follows that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X^C, C[1]) = 0$. Therefore, the triangle (η) splits giving us that C is a direct summand of Y^C, and hence $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) \leq \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(Y^C) \leq \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega^\wedge) = 0$.

Assume that $n > 0$. Since $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(Y^C) = 0 = \mathrm{id}_\omega(Y^C)$, it follows from 4.7 that $\mathrm{id}_\omega(X^C) \leq n-1$. Hence, by induction $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(X^C) \leq \mathrm{id}_\omega(X^C) \leq n-1$. Therefore, applying again 4.7 to the triangle (η), we get that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) \leq n = \mathrm{id}_\omega(C)$; proving the result.

(b) By 3.2, the item (a) and the fact that ${}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{X}$ the result follows. □

5. Some connection with Rouquier's dimension

In this section, we introduce some kind of "relative Rouquier's dimension"; and relate it with the Rouquier's dimension and the other relative dimensions developed in this paper.

Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be classes of objects in a triangulated category $\mathcal{T}$. Consider the smallest subcategory $\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle$ of $\mathcal{T}$ containing $\mathcal{X}$, closed under shifts, finite direct sums and direct summands, that is, $\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle := \mathrm{add}\,(\cup_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{X}[i])$. Let $\mathcal{X} \diamondsuit \mathcal{Y} := \langle \mathcal{X} * \mathcal{Y} \rangle$. Following R. Rouquier, we inductively define $\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_0 := 0$ and $\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_n := \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_{n-1} \diamondsuit \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle$ for $n \geq 1$. The objects of $\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_n$ are the direct summands of the objects obtained by taking a n-fold extension of finite direct sums of shifts of objects of $\mathcal{X}$.

The following dimension for triangulated categories was introduced by R. Rouquier and has been extensively studied in [17].

Definition 5.1. [17, Definition 3.2] *Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a triangulated category. The dimension of $\mathcal{T}$ is*

$$\dim(\mathcal{T}) := \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid \text{there exists } X \in \mathcal{T} \text{ such that } \langle X \rangle_{n+1} = \mathcal{T}\}.$$

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a class of objects in a triangulated category $\mathcal{T}$. Then, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the following statements hold.*

(a) $\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_{n+1} = \langle \varepsilon_n^\wedge(\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle) \rangle = \langle \varepsilon_n^\vee(\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle) \rangle$.

(b) $\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_n \subseteq \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_{n+1}$.

Proof. (a) By induction over n, it can be seen that $\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_{n+1} = \left\langle *_{i=1}^{n+1} \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle \right\rangle$. On the other hand, from 2.2 (b), we have $\varepsilon_n^\wedge(\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle) = *_{i=0}^{n} \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle [i] = *_{i=1}^{n+1} \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle$ since $\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle [i] = \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle$ for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}$; proving that $\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_{n+1} = \langle \varepsilon_n^\wedge(\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle) \rangle$. Similarly, by the dual of 2.2 (b), it follows that $\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_{n+1} = \langle \varepsilon_n^\vee(\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle) \rangle$.

(b) It follows from (a) and 2.2 (c), since $0 \in \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle$. □

In what follows, we introduce the relative Rouquier's dimension as follows.

Definition 5.3. *Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a triangulated category, $\mathcal{X}$ a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ and $M \in \mathcal{T}$. The $\mathcal{X}$-dimension of M is*

$$\dim_{\mathcal{X}}(M) := \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \textit{ such that } M \in \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_{n+1}\}.$$

For a class $\mathcal{Y}$ of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, we set $\dim_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) := \sup\{\dim_{\mathcal{X}}(Y) : \quad \forall\, Y \in \mathcal{Y}\}$.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a triangulated category, and $\mathcal{X}$, $\mathcal{Y}$ be classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) *For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\dim_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) \leq n$ if and only if $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_{n+1}$.*
(b) *If $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$ then $\dim_{\mathcal{Y}}(M) \leq \dim_{\mathcal{X}}(M) \;\; \forall\, M \in \mathcal{T}$.*

Proof. (a) Let $\dim_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) \leq n$. Hence, for all $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, we have $m(Y) := \dim_{\mathcal{X}}(Y) \leq n$. Therefore, from 5.2 (b), it follows that $Y \in \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_{m(Y)+1} \subseteq \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_{n+1}$; proving that $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_{n+1}$. Finally, assume that $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_{n+1}$. So, it follows directly that $\dim_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) \leq n$

(b) Let $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$ and $M \in \mathcal{T}$. Thus $\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle \subseteq \langle \mathcal{Y} \rangle$ and hence $*_{i=1}^{n} \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle \subseteq *_{i=1}^{n} \langle \mathcal{Y} \rangle \subseteq \langle *_{i=1}^{n} \langle \mathcal{Y} \rangle \rangle = \langle \mathcal{Y} \rangle_n$. Therefore $\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_n \subseteq \langle \mathcal{Y} \rangle_n$ and so we get that $\dim_{\mathcal{Y}}(M) \leq \dim_{\mathcal{X}}(M)$. $\square$

Now, the relative Rouquier's dimension is related to the Rouquier's dimension as follows.

Proposition 5.5. *Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a triangulated category. Then,*

$$\dim(\mathcal{T}) = \min\{\dim_X(\mathcal{T}) : \quad \forall\, X \in \mathcal{T}\}.$$

Proof. From 5.4 (a), we can write down the following equalities

$$\begin{aligned} \dim(\mathcal{T}) &= \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid \text{there exists } X \in \mathcal{T} \text{ such that } \langle X \rangle_{n+1} = \mathcal{T}\} \\ &= \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid \text{there exists } X \in \mathcal{T} \text{ such that } \dim_X(\mathcal{T}) \leq n\} \\ &= \min\{\dim_X(\mathcal{T}) \quad \forall\, X \in \mathcal{T}\}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

The following are some relationships between relative Rouquier's dimension and the other relative dimensions as coresolution, resolution, relative projective and relative injective.

Proposition 5.6. *Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a triangulated category, $\mathcal{X}$ a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ and $M \in \mathcal{T}$. Then, we have that*

$$\dim_{\mathcal{X}}(M) \leq \max\{\operatorname{resdim}_{\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle}(M), \operatorname{coresdim}_{\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle}(M)\}.$$

Proof. From 5.2 (a), we have the inclusions $\varepsilon_n^{\wedge}(\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle) \subseteq \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_{n+1}$ and $\varepsilon_n^{\vee}(\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle) \subseteq \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_{n+1}$. Hence the result follows. $\square$

Proposition 5.7. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ which are closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$. If $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under extensions and ω is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$, then*

$$\dim_{\mathcal{X}}(C) \leq \operatorname{pd}_{\omega}(C) < \infty, \quad \forall\, C \in \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}.$$

Proof. It follows from 5.6 and 4.6, since $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle$. $\square$

Proposition 5.8. *Let* $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ *be a pair of classes of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$ *which are closed under direct summands in* $\mathcal{T}$. *If* $\mathcal{X}$ *is cosuspended and* ω *is an* $\mathcal{X}$*-injective weak-cogenerator in* $\mathcal{X}$, *then*

$$\dim_{\omega}(C) \leq \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) = \mathrm{id}_{\omega}(C) < \infty, \quad \forall\, C \in \omega^{\vee}.$$

Proof. By 4.17, we know that $\mathrm{id}_{\omega}(C) = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) < \infty$ for any $C \in \omega^{\sim}$. On the other hand, from 4.2 (b), it follows that $\omega = {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U} \cap {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1]$ since $\mathcal{X} = {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}$. In particular, the dual of 3.4 (b) holds (take $\mathcal{Y} := \omega$) and hence $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) = \mathrm{coresdim}_{\omega}(C)$ for any $C \in \omega^{\vee}$. Observe that $\omega^{\vee} \subseteq \omega^{\sim}$ since $\omega^{\sim}$ is the smallest triangulated subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ containing ω (see 4.16 (b)). Therefore $\mathrm{id}_{\omega}(C) = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) < \infty$ for any $C \in \omega^{\vee}$. Finally, from 5.6, we get that $\dim_{\omega}(C) \leq \mathrm{coresdim}_{\omega}(C)$ since $\omega \subseteq \langle \omega \rangle$, proving the result. $\square$

In what follows, $\mathcal{T}$ is assumed to be a k-linear, Hom-finite triangulated and Krull-Schmidt category over a fixed field k; and $\mathcal{C}$ is a Krull-Schmidt subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ which is closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$. It is said that $\mathcal{C}$ is n-cluster tilting (see [13]) if it is functorially finite and $\mathcal{C} = \cap_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathcal{C}[-i]^{\perp} = \cap_{i=1}^{n-1} {}^{\perp}\mathcal{C}[i]$.

The following is an example of a triangulated category $\mathcal{T}$ having finite $\mathcal{C}$-dimension.

Proposition 5.9. *Let* $\mathcal{C}$ *be a* n*-cluster tilting subcategory of* $\mathcal{T}$. *Then,*

$$\dim_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{T}) \leq \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{T}) \leq n-1.$$

Proof. From [11, Theorem 3.1], we know that $\mathcal{T} = *_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{C}[i]$. Therefore, by 2.2 (b), we conclude that $\mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{T}) \leq n-1$. Finally, by 5.6, it follows that $\dim_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{T}) \leq \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{T})$ since $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \langle \mathcal{C} \rangle$; proving the result. $\square$

Acknowledgement The authors are very grateful to the referee for the comments, corrections and suggestions.

References

[1] L. Angeleri Hügel, O. Mendoza. Homological dimensions in cotorsion pairs. *Illinois J. Math.* 53, no1 (2009), 251-263.

[2] M. Auslander, R.O. Buchweitz. The Homological theory of maximal Cohen-Macaulay approximations. *Societe Mathematique de France* 38 (1989), 5-37.

[3] M. Auslander, I. Reiten. Applications of contravariantly finite subcategories. *Advances in Math.* 86 (1991), 111-152.

[4] M. Auslander, S. O. Smalo. Preprojective modules over artin algebra. *J. Algebra* 66 (1980), 61-122.

[5] A. A. Beilinson, J. Bernstein, P. Deligne. Faisceaux pervers. *Asterisque* 100 (1982).

[6] M. V. Bondarko. Weight structures for triangulated categories: weight filtrations, weight spectral sequences and weight complexes, applications to motives and to the stable homotopy category. Preprint available at http://arxiv.org/abs/0704.4003v1

[7] A. B. Buan. Subcategories of the derived category and cotilting complexes. *Colloq. Math.* 88 (2001), no. 1, 1-11.
[8] A. Beligiannis, I. Reiten. Homological and homotopical aspects of torsion theories. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* 188 (2007) no. 883.
[9] E. Enochs. Injective and flat covers, envelopes and resolvents. *Israel J. Math.* 39 (1981), 189-209.
[10] M. Hashimoto. Auslander-Buchweitz approximations of equivariant modules. *LMS, Lecture Notes Series* 282 (2000) Cambridge University Press.
[11] O. Iyama, Y. Yoshino. Mutation in triangulated categories and rigid Cohen-Macaulay modules. *Invent. math.* 172,(2008), 117-168.
[12] H. Krause. Derived categories, resolutions, and Brown representability. Notes of a Course at the Summer School Interactions between Homotopy Theory and Algebra. Chicago, July 2004
[13] B. Keller, I. Reiten. Cluster tilted algebras are Gorenstein and stably Calabi-Yau. *Adv. Math.* 211(1), 123-151, (2007).
[14] O. Mendoza, C. Sáenz. Tilting categories with applications to stratifying systems. *Journal of Algebra,* 302 (2006) 419-449.
[15] O. Mendoza, C. Sáenz, V. Santiago, M. J. Souto Salorio. Auslander-Buchwetiz context and co-t-structures. *Preprint* 2010.
[16] D. Pauksztello. Compact corigid objects in triangulated categories and co-t-structures. *Cent. Eur. J. Math.* 6 (2008), no. 1, 25-42.
[17] R. Rouquier. Dimension of triangulated categories. *K-Theory* 1 (2008), 193-256.

Octavio Mendoza Hernández:
Instituto de Matemáticas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
Circuito Exterior, Ciudad Universitaria, C.P. 04510, México, D.F. MEXICO.
`omendoza@matem.unam.mx`

Edith Corina Sáenz Valadez:
Departamento de Matemáticas, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
Circuito Exterior, Ciudad Universitaria, C.P. 04510, México, D.F. MEXICO.
`ecsv@lya.fciencias.unam.mx`

Valente Santiago Vargas:
Instituto de Matemáticas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
Circuito Exterior, Ciudad Universitaria, C.P. 04510, México, D.F. MEXICO.
`valente@matem.unam.mx`

María José Souto Salorio:
Facultade de Informática, Universidade da Coruña
15071 A Coruña, ESPAÑA.
`mariaj@udc.es`

arXiv:1002.3926v4 [math.CT] 9 Oct 2011

AUSLANDER-BUCHWEITZ APPROXIMATION THEORY FOR TRIANGULATED CATEGORIES

O. MENDOZA, E. C. SÁENZ, V. SANTIAGO, M. J. SOUTO SALORIO.

Abstract. We introduce and develop an analogous of the Auslander-Buchweitz approximation theory (see [2]) in the context of triangulated categories, by using a version of relative homology in this setting. We also prove several results concerning relative homological algebra in a triangulated category $\mathcal{T}$, which are based on the behavior of certain subcategories under finiteness of resolutions and vanishing of Hom-spaces. For example: we establish the existence of preenvelopes (and precovers) in certain triangulated subcategories of $\mathcal{T}$. The results resemble various constructions and results of Auslander and Buchweitz, and are concentrated in exploring the structure of a triangulated category $\mathcal{T}$ equipped with a pair $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$, where $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under extensions and ω is a weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$, usually under additional conditions. This reduces, among other things, to the existence of distinguished triangles enjoying special properties, and the behavior of (suitably defined) (co)resolutions, projective or injective dimension of objects of $\mathcal{T}$ and the formation of orthogonal subcategories. Finally, some relationships with the Rouquier's dimension in triangulated categories is discussed.

1. Introduction.

The approximation theory has its origin with the concept of injective envelopes and it has had a wide development in the context of module categories since the fifties.

In independent papers, Auslander, Reiten and Smalo (for the category $\mathrm{mod}\,(\Lambda)$ of finitely generated modules over an artin algebra Λ), and Enochs (for the category $\mathrm{Mod}\,(R)$ of modules over an arbitrary ring R) introduced a general approximation theory involving precovers and preenvelopes (see [3], [4] and [9]).

Auslander and Buchweitz (see [2]) studied the ideas of injective envelopes and projective covers in terms of maximal Cohen-Macaulay approximations for certain modules. In their work, they also studied the relationship between the relative injective dimension and the coresolution dimension of a module.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 18E30 and 18G20. Secondary 18G25.

The authors thank the financial support received from Project PAPIIT-UNAM IN101607 and MICINN-FEDER TIN2010-18552-C03-02.

They developed their theory in the context of abelian categories providing important applications in several settings.

Based on [2], Hashimoto defined the so called "Auslander-Buchweitz context" for abelian categories, giving a new framework to homological approximation theory (see [10]).

Recently, triangulated categories entered into the subject in a relevant way and several authors have studied the concept of approximation in both contexts, abelian and triangulated categories (see, for example, [1] [7], [8] and [14]).

In this paper, an analogous theory of approximations in the sense of Auslander and Buchweitz (see [2]), is developed for triangulated categories. Throughout this paper, $\mathcal{T}$ denotes an arbitrary triangulated category and $\mathcal{X}$ a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. The main result (Theorem 5.4) deals with a pair $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, where $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under extensions, and ω satisfies a weak cogenerating condition with respect to the objects of $\mathcal{X}$. Like Auslander and Buchweitz, we consider the class $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ of objects of $\mathcal{T}$ admitting a finite resolution by objects of $\mathcal{X}$. We prove that any object of $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ admits two distinguished triangles: one giving rise to a right $\mathcal{X}$-approximation, and the other to a left $\omega^{\wedge}$-approximation. In the present paper, it is also introduced and discussed a notion of $\mathcal{X}$-resolution dimension, which is compared with other relative homological dimensions.

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 1, we give some basic notions and properties of triangulated categories, that will be used in the rest of the work.

In Section 2, we study the notion of $\mathcal{X}$-resolution dimension which allows us to characterize the triangulated subcategory $\Delta_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X})$ of $\mathcal{T}$, generated by a cosuspended subcategory $\mathcal{X}$ of $\mathcal{T}$ (see Theorem 3.5).

In Section 3, the properties of the $\mathcal{X}$-projective (respectively, $\mathcal{X}$-injective) dimension and its relation to the $\mathcal{X}$-resolution (respectively, coresolution) dimension are established. The main result of this section is Theorem 4.4 that relates different kinds of relative homological dimensions by using suitable subcategories of $\mathcal{T}$.

In Section 4, we focus our attention to the notions of $\mathcal{X}$-injectives and weak-cogenerators in $\mathcal{X}$. We relate these ideas to the concepts of injective and coresolution dimension. This leads us to characterize several triangulated subcategories; and moreover, in Theorem 5.4 we establish the existence of $\mathcal{X}$-precovers and $\omega^{\wedge}$-preenvelopes. Finally, in Theorem 5.16, for a given pair $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ satisfying certain conditions, we give several characterizations of the triangulated subcategory $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}}(\omega)$ of $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ generated by ω.

We remark that the results we get will be applied in a forthcoming paper [15], where a connection between Auslander-Buchweitz approximation theory in triangulated categories and co-t-structures (see [6] and [16]) is established.

Finally, some relationship with other notions, as torsion theories (see Corollary 5.12) in the sense of Iyama-Yoshino [11] and Rouquier's dimension [17], are discussed (see Section 5).

2. Preliminaries

Throughout this paper, $\mathcal{T}$ will be a triangulated category and $[1] : \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{T}$ its suspension functor. The term subcategory, in this paper, means a subcategory which is full, additive, and closed under isomorphisms.

An important tool, which is a consequence of the octahedral axiom in $\mathcal{T}$, is the so-called co-base change (see [12]). That is, for any diagram in $\mathcal{T}$

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & Y \\
Z &
\end{tikzcd}$$

there exists a commutative and exact diagram in $\mathcal{T}$

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & W[-1] \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d] & W[-1] \arrow[d] & \\
U[-1] \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & X \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & Y \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & U \arrow[d, equal] \\
U[-1] \arrow[r] & Z \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & E \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & U \\
 & W \arrow[r, equal] & W &
\end{tikzcd}$$

where exact means that the rows and columns, in the preceding diagram, are distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$. The base change, which is the dual notion of co-base change, also holds (see [12]).

Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. We put ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{X} := \{Z \in \mathcal{T} : \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(Z, -)|_{\mathcal{X}} = 0\}$ and $\mathcal{X}^{\perp} := \{Z \in \mathcal{T} : \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(-, Z)|_{\mathcal{X}} = 0\}$. We denote by $\mathcal{X} * \mathcal{Y}$ the class of objects $Z \in \mathcal{T}$ for which exists a distinguished triangle $X \to Z \to Y \to X[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$. In case $\mathcal{Y} = \{Y\}$, we write $\mathcal{X} * Y$ instead of $\mathcal{X} * \mathcal{Y}$.
It is also well known that the operation $*$ is associative (see [5, 1.3.10]). Furthermore, it is said that $\mathcal{X}$ is **closed under extensions** if $\mathcal{X} * \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$.

Recall that a class $\mathcal{X}$ of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ is said to be **suspended** (respectively, **cosuspended**) if $\mathcal{X}[1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ (respectively, $\mathcal{X}[-1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}$) and $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under extensions. By the following lemma, it is easy to see, that a suspended (respectively, cosuspended) class $\mathcal{X}$ of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, can be considered as a subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$.*

(a) *If $0 \in \mathcal{X}$ then $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \mathcal{Y}$ and $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{Y} * \mathcal{X}$ for any class $\mathcal{Y}$ of objects in $\mathcal{T}$.*

(b) *If $\mathcal{X}$ is either suspended or cosuspended, then $0 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X} * \mathcal{X}$.*

Proof. (a) If $0 \in \mathcal{X}$ then we get $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X}*\mathcal{Y}$ by using the distinguished triangle $0 \to Y \overset{1_Y}{\to} Y \to 0$ for any $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$. The other inclusion follows similarly.

(b) Let $\mathcal{X}$ be cosuspended (the other case, is analogous). Then, it follows that $0 \in \mathcal{X}$ since we have the distinguished triangle $X[-1] \to 0 \to X \to X$ for any $X \in \mathcal{X}$. Hence (b) follows from (a). $\Box$

Given a class $\mathcal{X}$ of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, it is said that $\mathcal{X}$ is **closed under cones** if for any distinguished triangle $A \to B \to C \to A[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $A, B \in \mathcal{X}$ we have that $C \in \mathcal{X}$. Similarly, $\mathcal{X}$ is **closed under cocones** if for any distinguished triangle $A \to B \to C \to A[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $B, C \in \mathcal{X}$ we have that $A \in \mathcal{X}$.

We denote by $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ (respectively, ${}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}$) the smallest suspended (respectively, cosuspended) subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ containing the class $\mathcal{X}$. Note that if $\mathcal{X}$ is suspended (respectively, cosuspended) subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$, then $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ (respectively, $\mathcal{X} = {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}$). We also recall that a subcategory $\mathcal{U}$ of $\mathcal{T}$, which is suspended and cosuspended, is called **triangulated subcategory** of $\mathcal{T}$. A **thick** subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ is a triangulated subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ which is closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$. We also denote by $\Delta_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X})$ (respectively, $\overline{\Delta}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X})$) to the smallest triangulated (respectively, smallest thick) subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ containing the class $\mathcal{X}$. Observe that $\Delta_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \overline{\Delta}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X})$. For the following definition, see [3], [7], [8] and [9].

Definition 2.2. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be classes of objects in the triangulated category $\mathcal{T}$. A morphism $f : X \to C$ in $\mathcal{T}$ is said to be an $\mathcal{X}$-**precover** of C if $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X', f) : \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X', X) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X', C)$ is surjective, $\forall X' \in \mathcal{X}$. If any $C \in \mathcal{Y}$ admits an $\mathcal{X}$-precover, then $\mathcal{X}$ is called a* **precovering class** *in $\mathcal{Y}$. By dualizing the definition above, we get the notion of an $\mathcal{X}$-***preenveloping** *of C and a* **preenveloping class** *in $\mathcal{Y}$.*

Finally, in order to deal with the (co)resolution, relative projective and relative injective dimensions, we consider the extended natural numbers $\overline{\mathbb{N}} := \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$. Here, we set the following rules: (a) $x + \infty = \infty$ for any $x \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}$, (b) $x < \infty$ for any $x \in \mathbb{N}$ and (c) $\min(\emptyset) := \infty$.

3. RESOLUTION AND CORESOLUTION DIMENSIONS

Now, we define certain classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ which will lead us to the notions of resolution and coresolution dimensions.

Definition 3.1. *Let* $\mathcal{X}$ *be a class of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$*. For any natural number* n*, we introduce inductively the class* $\varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$ *as follows:* $\varepsilon_0^\wedge(\mathcal{X}) := \mathcal{X}$ *and assuming defined* $\varepsilon_{n-1}^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$*, the class* $\varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$ *is given by all the objects* $Z \in \mathcal{T}$ *for which there exists a distinguished triangle in* $\mathcal{T}$

$$Z[-1] \longrightarrow W \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow Z$$

with $W \in \varepsilon_{n-1}^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$ *and* $X \in \mathcal{X}$*.*

Dually, we set $\varepsilon_0^\vee(\mathcal{X}) := \mathcal{X}$ *and supposing defined* $\varepsilon_{n-1}^\vee(\mathcal{X})$*, the class* $\varepsilon_n^\vee(\mathcal{X})$ *is formed for all the objects* $Z \in \mathcal{T}$ *for which there exists a distinguished triangle in* $\mathcal{T}$

$$Z \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow K \longrightarrow Z[1]$$

with $K \in \varepsilon_{n-1}^\vee(\mathcal{X})$ *and* $X \in \mathcal{X}$*.*

We have the following properties for $\varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$ (and the similar ones for $\varepsilon_n^\vee(\mathcal{X})$).

Proposition 3.2. *Let* $\mathcal{T}$ *be a triangulated category,* $\mathcal{X}$ *be a class of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$*, and* n *a natural number. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) *For any* $Z \in \mathcal{T}$ *and* $n > 0$*, we have that* $Z \in \varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$ *if and only if there is a family* $\{K_j[-1] \to K_{j+1} \to X_j \to K_j\}_{j=0}^{n-1}$ *of distinguished triangles in* $\mathcal{T}$ *with* $K_0 = Z$*,* $X_j \in \mathcal{X}$ *and* $K_n \in \mathcal{X}$*.*

(b) $\varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X}) = *_{i=0}^{n}\,\mathcal{X}[i] := \mathcal{X} * \mathcal{X}[1] * \cdots * \mathcal{X}[n]$.

(c) *If* $0 \in \mathcal{X}$ *then* $\mathcal{X}[n] \subseteq \varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \varepsilon_{n+1}^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$ *and* $\varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X})[1] \subseteq \varepsilon_{n+1}^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$ $\forall\, n \in \mathbb{N}$*.*

Proof. (a) If $n = 1$ then the equivalence follows from the definition of $\varepsilon_1^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$. Let $n \geq 2$ and suppose (by induction) that the equivalence is true for $\varepsilon_{n-1}^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$. By definition, $Z \in \varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$ if and only if there is a distinguished triangle in $\mathcal{T}$

$$Z[-1] \longrightarrow K_1 \longrightarrow X_0 \longrightarrow Z$$

with $K_1 \in \varepsilon_{n-1}^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$ and $X_0 \in \mathcal{X}$. On the other hand, by induction, we have that $K_1 \in \varepsilon_{n-1}^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$ if and only if there is a family $\{K_j[-1] \to K_{j+1} \to X_j \to K_j\}_{j=1}^{n-1}$ of distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X_j \in \mathcal{X}$ and $K_n \in \mathcal{X}$; proving (a).

(b) By definition, we have that $\varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{X} * \varepsilon_{n-1}^\wedge(\mathcal{X})[1]$. So, by induction, it follows that $\varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{X} * (*_{i=0}^{n-1}\mathcal{X}[i])[1] = *_{i=0}^{n}\,\mathcal{X}[i]$.

(c) Assume that $0 \in \mathcal{X}$. By (b), we know that $\varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X}) = \varepsilon_{n-1}^\wedge(\mathcal{X}) * \mathcal{X}[n]$; and since $0 \in \varepsilon_{n-1}^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$, it follows from 2.1 (a) that $\mathcal{X}[n] \subseteq \varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$. Similarly, from the equalities $\varepsilon_{n+1}^\wedge(\mathcal{X}) = \varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X}) * \mathcal{X}[n+1]$ and $\varepsilon_{n+1}^\wedge(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{X} * \varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X})[1]$, and the facts that $0 \in \mathcal{X}[n+1]$ and $0 \in \mathcal{X}$, we get the other inclusions from 2.1 (a). □

Following [2] and [7], we introduce the notion of $\mathcal{X}$-resolution (respectively, coresolution) dimension of any class $\mathcal{Y}$ of objects of $\mathcal{T}$.

Definition 3.3. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$.*

(a) $\mathcal{X}^\wedge := \cup_{n\geq 0}\, \varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$ *and* $\mathcal{X}^\vee := \cup_{n\geq 0}\, \varepsilon_n^\vee(\mathcal{X})$.

(b) *For any $M \in \mathcal{T}$, the $\mathcal{X}$-**resolution dimension** of M is*

$$\operatorname{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) := \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \ :\ M \in \varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X})\}.$$

*Dually, the $\mathcal{X}$-**coresolution dimension** of M is*

$$\operatorname{coresdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) := \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} :\ M \in \varepsilon_n^\vee(\mathcal{X})\}.$$

(c) *For any subclass $\mathcal{Y}$ of $\mathcal{T}$, we set* $\operatorname{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) := \sup\{\operatorname{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) : M \in \mathcal{Y}\}$. *Similarly, we also have* $\operatorname{coresdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y})$.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, $0 \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) $\operatorname{resdim}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X}) \leq n$ *if and only if* $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{Y}) = *_{i=0}^n\, \mathcal{Y}[i]$.

(b) *If $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under extensions, then $\mathcal{X} * \mathcal{X}^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge$.*

(c) *If $\mathcal{X}$ is cosuspended, then $\varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{X}[n]$.*

Proof. (a) It follows by definition and 3.2 (b),(c).

(b) It follows from 3.2 (b) since $\mathcal{X} * \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$.

(c) Let $\mathcal{X}$ be cosuspended. since $0 \in \mathcal{X}$ (see 2.1 (b)), we get from 3.2 (b), (c) that $\mathcal{X}[n] \subseteq \varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X}) = *_{i=0}^n\, \mathcal{X}[i]$. On the other hand, using that $\mathcal{X} * \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{X}[-1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, we conclude that $*_{i=0}^n\, \mathcal{X}[i] = (*_{i=0}^n\, \mathcal{X}[i-n])[n] \subseteq (*_{i=0}^n\, \mathcal{X})[n] \subseteq \mathcal{X}[n]$. □

The following result will be useful in this paper. The item (a) already appeared in [7]. We also recall that $\Delta_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X})$ (respectively, $\overline{\Delta}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X})$) stands for the smallest triangulated (respectively, smallest thick) subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ containing the class of objects $\mathcal{X}$.

Theorem 3.5. *For any cosuspended subcategory $\mathcal{X}$ of $\mathcal{T}$ and any object $C \in \mathcal{T}$, the following statements hold.*

(a) $\operatorname{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) \leq n$ *if and only if* $C \in \mathcal{X}[n]$.

(b) $\mathcal{X}^\wedge = \cup_{n\geq 0}\, \mathcal{X}[n] = \Delta_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X})$.

(c) *If $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$, then* $\mathcal{X}^\wedge = \overline{\Delta}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X})$.

Proof. (a) If follows from 3.4 (a), (c) since $0 \in \mathcal{X}$ (see 2.1 (b)).

(b) From 3.4 (c), we get $\mathcal{X}^\wedge = \cup_{n\geq 0}\, \mathcal{X}[n]$; and hence $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ is closed under positive and negative shifts. We prove now that $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ is closed under extensions. Indeed, let $X[n] \to Y \to X'[m] \to X[n][1]$ be a distinguished triangle in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X, X' \in \mathcal{X}$. We assume that $n \leq m$ and then $X[n] = X[n-m][m] \in \mathcal{X}[m]$ since $n-m \leq 0$ and $\mathcal{X}[-1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. Using now that $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under extensions, it follows that $Y \in \mathcal{X}[m] \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge$; proving that $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ is closed under extensions.

Hence $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ is a triangulated subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ and moreover it is the smallest one containing $\mathcal{X}$ since $\mathcal{X}^\wedge = \cup_{n\geq 0}\,\mathcal{X}[n]$.

(c) It follows from (b). $\Box$

Remark 3.6. (1) *Observe that a suspended class $\mathcal{U}$ of $\mathcal{T}$ is closed under cones. Indeed, if $A \to B \to C \to A[1]$ is a distinguished triangle in $\mathcal{T}$ with $A, B \in \mathcal{U}$ then $A[1], B \in \mathcal{U}$; and so we get $C \in \mathcal{U}$. Similarly, if $\mathcal{U}$ is cosuspended then it is closed under cocones.*

(2) *Let $(\mathcal{Y}, \omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ with $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$. If $\mathcal{Y}$ is closed under cones (respectively, cocones) then $\omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$ (respectively, $\omega^\vee \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$). Indeed, assume that $\mathcal{Y}$ is closed under cones and let $M \in \omega^\wedge$. Thus $M \in \varepsilon_n^\wedge(\omega)$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If $n = 0$ then $M \in \omega \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$. Let $n > 0$, and hence there is a distinguished triangle $M[-1] \to K \to Y \to M$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $K \in \varepsilon_{n-1}^\wedge(\omega)$ and $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$. By induction $K \in \mathcal{Y}$ and hence $M \in \mathcal{Y}$ since $\mathcal{Y}$ is closed under cones; proving that $\omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$.*

(3) *Note that $\mathcal{X}^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}$ (respectively, $\mathcal{X}^\vee \subseteq {}_\mathcal{X}\mathcal{U}$) since $\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}$ (respectively, ${}_\mathcal{X}\mathcal{U}$) is closed under cones (respectively, cocones) and contains $\mathcal{X}$.*

Using the fact that the functor Hom is a cohomological one, we get the following description of the orthogonal categories. In particular, observe that ${}_\mathcal{X}\mathcal{U}^\perp$ (respectively, ${}^\perp\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}$) is a suspended (respectively, cosuspended) subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$.

Lemma 3.7. *For any class $\mathcal{X}$ of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, we have that*

(a) ${}^\perp\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X} = \{Z \in \mathcal{T} \;:\; \mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(Z, X[i]) = 0, \quad \forall i \geq 0, \forall X \in \mathcal{X}\}$,

(b) ${}_\mathcal{X}\mathcal{U}^\perp = \{Z \in \mathcal{T} \;:\; \mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(X[i], Z) = 0, \quad \forall i \leq 0, \forall X \in \mathcal{X}\}$.

Proof. It is straightforward. $\Box$

Lemma 3.8. *Let $\mathcal{Y}$ and $\mathcal{X}$ be classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, $n \geq 1$ and $Z \in \mathcal{T}$. The following statements hold.*

(a) *The object Z belongs to $\mathcal{Y} * \mathcal{Y}[1] * \cdots * \mathcal{Y}[n-1] * \mathcal{X}[n]$ if and only if there exists a family $\{K_i \to Y_i \to K_{i+1} \to K_i[1] \;:\; Y_i \in \mathcal{Y}\}_{i=0}^{n-1}$ of distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$ with $K_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $Z = K_n$.*

(b) *The object Z belongs to $\mathcal{X}[-n] * \mathcal{Y}[-n+1] * \cdots * \mathcal{Y}[-1] * \mathcal{Y}$ if and only if there exists a family $\{K_{i+1} \to Y_i \to K_i \to K_{i+1}[1] \;:\; Y_i \in \mathcal{Y}\}_{i=0}^{n-1}$ of distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$ with $K_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $Z = K_n$.*

Proof. (a) We proceed by induction on n. If $n = 1$ then (a) is trivial. Suppose that $n \geq 2$ and consider the class

$$\mathcal{Z}_{n-1} := \mathcal{Y} * \mathcal{Y}[1] * \cdots * \mathcal{Y}[n-2] * \mathcal{X}[n-1].$$

It is clear that $\mathcal{Y} * \mathcal{Y}[1] * \cdots * \mathcal{Y}[n-1] * \mathcal{X}[n] = \mathcal{Y} * \mathcal{Z}_{n-1}[1]$; and then, we have that $Z \in \mathcal{Y} * \mathcal{Y}[1] * \cdots * \mathcal{Y}[n-1] * \mathcal{X}[n]$ if and only if there is a distinguished triangle

$$K \longrightarrow Y \longrightarrow Z \longrightarrow K[1]$$

in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $K \in \mathcal{Z}_{n-1}$. On the other hand, by induction, we have that $K \in \mathcal{Z}_{n-1}$ if and only if there is a family $\{K_i \to Y_i \to K_{i+1} \to K_i[1] \,:\, Y_i \in \mathcal{Y}\}_{i=0}^{n-2}$ of distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$ with $K_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $K = K_{n-1}$. So the result follows by adding the triangle above to the preceding family of triangles.

(b) It is similar to (a). $\square$

4. Relative homological dimensions

In this section, we introduce the $\mathcal{X}$-projective (respectively, injective) dimension of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. Moreover, we establish a result that relates this relative projective dimension with the resolution dimension as can be seen in Theorem 4.4.

Definition 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ and M an object in $\mathcal{T}$.*

(a) *The $\mathcal{X}$-**projective dimension** of M is*

$$\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) := \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \,:\, \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(M[-i], -)\,|_{\mathcal{X}} = 0, \quad \forall i > n\}.$$

(b) *The $\mathcal{X}$-**injective dimension** of M is*

$$\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) := \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \,:\, \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(-, M[i])\,|_{\mathcal{X}} = 0, \quad \forall i > n\}.$$

(c) *For any class $\mathcal{Y}$ of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, we set*

$$\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) := \sup\{\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) \,:\, C \in \mathcal{Y}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) := \sup\{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) \,:\, C \in \mathcal{Y}\}.$$

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) *For any $M \in \mathcal{T}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have that*
  (a1) *$\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) \le n$ if and only if $M \in {}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}[n+1]$;*
  (a2) *$\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) \le n$ if and only if $M \in {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-n-1]$.*

(b) *$\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X}) = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y})$ for any class $\mathcal{Y}$ of objects in $\mathcal{T}$.*

Proof. (a) follows from 3.7, and (b) is straightforward. $\square$

Proposition 4.3. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ and $M \in \mathcal{T}$. Then*

$$\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) = \mathrm{resdim}_{{}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}[1]}(M) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) = \mathrm{coresdim}_{{}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1]}(M).$$

Proof. Since ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is cosuspended (see 3.7 (a)), the first equality follows from 4.2 (a1) and 3.5 (a). The second equality can be proven similarly. $\square$

Now, we prove the following relationship between the relative projective dimension and the resolution dimension.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) \le \mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) + \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{Y}}(L), \quad \forall L \in \mathcal{T}.$

(b) *If* $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}} \cap {}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}[1]$ *and* $\mathcal{Y}$ *is closed under direct summands in* $\mathcal{T}$, *then*

$$\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) = \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{Y}}(L), \quad \forall L \in \mathcal{Y}^{\wedge}.$$

Proof. (a) Let $d := \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{Y}}(L)$ and $\alpha := \mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y})$. We may assume that d and α are finite. We prove (a) by induction on d. If $d = 0$, it follows that $L \in \mathcal{Y}$ and then (a) holds in this case.
Assume that $d \geq 1$. So we have a distinguished triangle $K \to Y \to L \to K[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $K \in \varepsilon^{\wedge}_{d-1}(\mathcal{Y})$. Applying the cohomological functor $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(-, M[j])$, with $M \in \mathcal{X}$, to the above triangle, we get and exact sequence of abelian groups

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(K[1], M[j]) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(L, M[j]) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(Y, M[j]).$$

By induction, we know that $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(K) \leq \alpha + d - 1$. Therefore $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(L, M[j]) = 0$ for $j > \alpha + d$ and so $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) \leq \alpha + d$.

(b) Let $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}} \cap^{\perp} \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}[1]$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$. Consider $L \in \mathcal{Y}^{\wedge}$ and let $d := \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{Y}}(L)$. By 4.2 we have that $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) = 0$ and then $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) \leq d$ (see (a)). We prove, by induction on d, that the equality given in (b) holds. For $d = 0$ it is clear.
Suppose that $d = 1$. Then, there is a distinguished triangle

$$\eta : \quad Y_1 \to Y_0 \to L \xrightarrow{f} Y_1[1] \text{ in } \mathcal{T} \text{ with } Y_i \in \mathcal{Y}.$$

If $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) = 0$ then $L \in {}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}[1]$ (see 4.2). Hence $f = 0$ since $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$; and therefore η splits giving us that $L \in \mathcal{Y}$, which is a contradiction since $d = 1$. So $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) > 0$ proving (b) for $d = 1$.
Assume now that $d \geq 2$. Thus we have a distinguished triangle $K \to Y \to L \to K[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, $K \in \varepsilon^{\wedge}_{d-1}(\mathcal{Y})$ and $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(K) = d - 1$ (by inductive hypothesis). Since $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) \leq d$, it is enough to see $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) > d - 1$. So, in case $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) \leq d - 1$, we apply the cohomological functor $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(-, X[d])$, with $X \in \mathcal{X}$, to the triangle $L \to K[1] \to Y[1] \to L[1]$. Then we get the following exact sequence of abelian groups

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(Y[1], X[d]) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(K[1], X[d]) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(L, X[d]).$$

Therefore $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(K[1], X[d]) = 0$ contradicting that $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(K) = d - 1$. This means that $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(L) > d - 1$; proving (b). □

Remark 4.5. *Note that if* $Y \neq 0$ *and* $Y \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}} \cap {}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}[1]$, *then* $Y[j] \notin \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}} \cap {}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}[1]$, $\forall j > 0$.

The following technical result will be used in Section 4.

Lemma 4.6. *Let* $\mathcal{X}$, $\mathcal{Y}$ *and* $\mathcal{Z}$ *be classes of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$. *Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee}) = \mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X})$.

(b) *If* $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\vee$ *then* $\mathrm{pd}_\mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{Z}) = \mathrm{pd}_\mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{X})$.

Proof. To prove (a), it is enough to see that $\mathrm{pd}_\mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{X}^\vee) \leq \mathrm{pd}_\mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{X})$. Let $M \in \mathcal{X}^\vee$. We prove by induction on $d := \mathrm{coresdim}_\mathcal{X}(M)$ that $\mathrm{pd}_\mathcal{Y}(M) \leq \mathrm{pd}_\mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{X})$. We may assume that $\alpha := \mathrm{pd}_\mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{X}) < \infty$. If $d = 0$ then we have that $M \in \mathcal{X}$ and there is nothing to prove.

Let $d \geq 1$. Then we have a distinguished triangle $M \to X \to K \to M[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X \in \mathcal{X}$, $K \in \varepsilon^\vee_{d-1}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\mathrm{pd}_\mathcal{Y}(K) \leq \alpha$ (by inductive hypothesis). Applying the cohomological functor $\mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(-, Y[i])$, with $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, we get the exact sequence of abelian groups

$$\mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(X, Y[i]) \to \mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(M, Y[i]) \to \mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(K, Y[i+1]).$$

Therefore $\mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(M, Y[i]) = 0$ for $i > \alpha$ since $\mathrm{pd}_\mathcal{Y}(K) \leq \alpha$. So we get that $\mathrm{pd}_\mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{X}^\vee) \leq \mathrm{pd}_\mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{X})$.

Finally, it is easy to see that (b) is a consequence of (a). □

The following two lemmas resembles the so called "shifting argument" that is usually used for syzygies and cosyzygies in the Ext^n functor.

Lemma 4.7. *Let* $\mathcal{X}$ *and* $\mathcal{Y}$ *be classes of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$ *such that* $\mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{Y}) = 0$. *Then, for any* $X \in \mathcal{X}$, $k > 0$ *and* $K_n \in \mathcal{Y} * \mathcal{Y}[1] * \cdots * \mathcal{Y}[n-1] * K_0[n]$, *there is an isomorphism of abelian groups*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(X, K_0[k+n]) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(X, K_n[k]).$$

Proof. Let $X \in \mathcal{X}$, $k > 0$ and $K_n \in \mathcal{Y} * \mathcal{Y}[1] * \cdots * \mathcal{Y}[n-1] * K_0[n]$. By 3.8 (a), we have distinguished triangles $\eta_i : \quad K_i \to Y_i \to K_{i+1} \to K_i[1]$ with $Y_i \in \mathcal{Y},\ 0 \leq i \leq n-1$. Applying the functor $\mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(X[-k], -)$ to η_i, we get the exact sequence of abelian groups

$$(X[-k], Y_i) \to (X[-k], K_{i+1}) \to (X[-k], K_i[1]) \to (X[-k], Y_i[1]),$$

where $(-,-) := \mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(-,-)$ for simplicity. Since $\mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{Y}) = 0$, it follows that $\mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(X[-k], K_{i+1}) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(X[-k], K_i[1])$. Therefore, by the preceding isomorphism, we have
$\mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(X, K_n[k]) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(X, K_{n-1}[k+1]) \simeq \cdots \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(X, K_0[k+n])$. □

Lemma 4.8. *Let* $\mathcal{X}$ *and* $\mathcal{Y}$ *be classes of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$ *such that* $\mathrm{pd}_\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{Y}) = 0$. *Then, for any* $X \in \mathcal{X}$, $k > 0$ *and* $K_n \in K_0[-n] * \mathcal{Y}[-n+1] * \cdots * \mathcal{Y}[-1] * \mathcal{Y}$, *there is an isomorphism of abelian groups*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(K_0, X[k+n]) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_T(K_n, X[k]).$$

Proof. The proof is similar to the one given in 4.7 by using 3.8 (b). □

5. RELATIVE WEAK-COGENERATORS AND RELATIVE INJECTIVES

In this section, we focus our attention on pairs $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. We study the relationship between weak-cogenerators in $\mathcal{X}$ and coresolutions. Also, we give a characterization of some special subcategories of $\mathcal{T}$.

Definition 5.1. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. We say that*

- (a) *ω is a* **weak-cogenerator** *in $\mathcal{X}$, if $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{X}[-1] * \omega$;*
- (b) *ω is a* **weak-generator** *in $\mathcal{X}$, if $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{X} \subseteq \omega * \mathcal{X}[1]$;*
- (c) *ω is* **$\mathcal{X}$-injective** *if $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega) = 0$; and dually, ω is* **$\mathcal{X}$-projective** *if $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega) = 0$.*

The following result say us that an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator, closed under direct summands, is unique (in case it exists).

Proposition 5.2. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ such that ω is $\mathcal{X}$-injective. Then, the following statements hold.*

- (a) *$\omega^{\wedge}$ is $\mathcal{X}$-injective.*
- (b) *If ω is a weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$, and ω is closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$, then*

$$\omega = \mathcal{X} \cap {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1] = \mathcal{X} \cap \omega^{\wedge}.$$

Proof. (a) It follows from the dual result of 4.6 (a).

(b) Let $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{X}[-1] * \omega$ and ω be closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$.

We start by proving the first equality. Let $X \in \mathcal{X} \cap {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1]$. Since $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{X}[-1] * \omega$, there is a distinguished triangle

$$\eta : \quad X \to W \to X' \xrightarrow{f} X[1] \text{ in } \mathcal{T} \text{ with } X' \in \mathcal{X} \text{ and } W \in \omega.$$

Moreover $X \in {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1]$ implies that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(-, X[1])|_{\mathcal{X}} = 0$ (see 3.7 (b)). Hence η splits and so $X \in \omega$; proving that $\mathcal{X} \cap {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1] \subseteq \omega$. The other inclusion follows from 4.2 (a2) since $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega) = 0$.

On the other hand, it is easy to see that $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{X} \cap \omega^{\wedge}$ and since $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega^{\wedge}) = 0$, it follows from 4.2 (a2) that $\mathcal{X} \cap \omega^{\wedge} \subseteq \mathcal{X} \cap {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1]$; proving (b). □

Proposition 5.3. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, and ω be closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$. If ω is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$, then*

$$\mathcal{X} \cap \omega^{\vee} = \{X \in \mathcal{X} \,:\, \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(X) < \infty\}.$$

Proof. Let $M \in \mathcal{X} \cap \omega^{\vee}$. We assert that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) \leq d < \infty$ where $d := \mathrm{coresdim}_{\omega}(M)$. Indeed, from 3.2 (a), dual version, and 3.8 (a), there is some $W_d \in \omega * \omega[1] * \cdots * \omega[d-1] * M[d]$ with $W_d \in \omega$. So, by 4.7 we get an isomorphism $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X, M[k+d]) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X, W_d[k])$ for any $k > 0$ and $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and using that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega) = 0$, it follows that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X, M[k+d]) = 0$ for any $k > 0$, proving that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) \leq d$.

Let $N \in \mathcal{X}$ be such that $n := \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(N) < \infty$. Using that $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{X}[-1] * \omega$, we can construct a family $\{K_i \to W_i \to K_{i+1} \to K_i[1] \;:\; W_i \in \omega,\ 0 \leq i \leq n-1\}$ of distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$ where $K_0 := N$ and $K_i \in \mathcal{X}$, $\forall i\ 0 \leq i \leq n$. Thus, by 3.8 (a), it follows that $K_n \in \omega * \omega[1] * \cdots * \omega[n-1] * N[n]$; and so by 4.7 we get that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X, K_n[k]) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X, N[k+n])$, $\forall X \in \mathcal{X}$, $\forall k > 0$. But $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X, N[k+n]) = 0$, $\forall X \in \mathcal{X}$, $\forall k > 0$ because $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(N) = n$. Therefore $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(K_n) = 0$ and then $K_n \in \omega$ (see 4.2 and 5.2 (b)); proving that $N \in \mathcal{X} \cap \omega^{\vee}$. $\square$

Now, we are in condition to prove the following result. In the statement, we use the notions of precovering and preenveloping classes (see Section 1).

Theorem 5.4. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, $\mathcal{X}$ be closed under extensions and ω be a weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) *For all $C \in \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ there exist two distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$:*
$C[-1] \longrightarrow Y_C \longrightarrow X_C \xrightarrow{\varphi_C} C$ *with* $Y_C \in \omega^{\wedge}$ *and* $X_C \in \mathcal{X}$,
$C \xrightarrow{\varphi^C} Y^C \longrightarrow X^C \longrightarrow C[1]$ *with* $Y^C \in \omega^{\wedge}$ *and* $X^C \in \mathcal{X}$.

(b) *If ω is $\mathcal{X}$-injective, then*

  (b1) $Y_C[1] \in \mathcal{X}^{\perp}$ *and* φ_C *is an $\mathcal{X}$-precover of* C,

  (b2) $X^C[-1] \in {}^{\perp}(\omega^{\wedge})$ *and* φ^C *is a $\omega^{\wedge}$-preenvelope of* C.

Proof. (a) Let $C \in \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$. We prove the existence of the triangles in (a) by induction on $n := \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(C)$. If $n = 0$, we have that $C \in \mathcal{X}$ and then we can consider $C[-1] \to 0 \to C \overset{1_C}{\to} C$ as the first triangle; the second one can be obtained from the fact that $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{X}[-1] * \omega$.

Assume that $n > 0$. Then, we have a distinguished triangle $C[-1] \to K_1 \to X_0 \to C$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(K_1) = n-1$. Hence, by induction, there is a distinguished triangle $K_1 \to Y^{K_1} \to X^{K_1} \to K_1[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y^{K_1} \in \omega^{\wedge}$ and $X^{K_1} \in \mathcal{X}$. By the co-base change procedure applied to the above triangles, there exists a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & X^{K_1}[-1] \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d] & X^{K_1}[-1] \arrow[d] & \\
C[-1] \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & K_1 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & X_0 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & C \arrow[d, equal] \\
C[-1] \arrow[r] & Y^{K_1} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & U \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & C \\
 & X^{K_1} \arrow[r, equal] & X^{K_1} &
\end{tikzcd}$$

where the rows and columns are distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$. Since $X_0, X^{K_1} \in \mathcal{X}$ it follows that $U \in \mathcal{X}$. By taking $X_C := U$ and $Y_C := Y^{K_1}$, we get the first triangle in (a). On the other hand, since $U \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{X}[-1] * \omega$, there exists a distinguished triangle $X^C[-1] \to U \to W \to X^C$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X^C \in \mathcal{X}$ and $W \in \omega$. Again, by the co-base change procedure, there exists a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
& Y^{K_1} \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d] & Y^{K_1} \arrow[d] & \\
X^C[-1] \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & U \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & W \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & X^C \arrow[d, equal] \\
X^C[-1] \arrow[r] & C \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & Y^C \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & X^C \\
& Y^{K_1}[1] \arrow[r, equal] & Y^{K_1}[1] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

where the rows and columns are distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$. By the second column, in the diagram above, it follows that $Y^C \in \omega^\wedge$. Hence the second row in the preceding diagram is the desired triangle.

(b2) Consider the triangle $X^C[-1] \xrightarrow{g} C \xrightarrow{\varphi^C} Y^C \to X^C$ with $Y^C \in \omega^\wedge$ and $X^C \in \mathcal{X}$. Since $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega) = 0$ we have by 5.2 that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega^\wedge) = 0$. Thus $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X[-1], -)|_{\omega^\wedge} = 0$ for any $X \in \mathcal{X}$; and so $X^C[-1] \in {}^{\perp}(\omega^\wedge)$. Let $f : C \to Y$ be a morphism in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y \in \omega^\wedge$. Since $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X^C[-1], Y) = 0$, we have that $fg = 0$ and hence f factors through φ^C; proving that φ^C is a $\omega^\wedge$-preenvelope of C.

(b1) It is similar to the proof of (b2). □

The following result provides a characterization of the category $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$, and will be applied in [15] to deal with co-t-structures.

Corollary 5.5. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ such that $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under extensions and ω is a weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) *If $0 \in \omega$ then $\mathcal{X}^\wedge = \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge = \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge[1]$.*

(b) *If $\mathcal{X}[-1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ then $\mathcal{X}^\wedge = \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge = \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge[1] = \mathcal{X}[-1] * \omega^\wedge$.*

Proof. We assert that $\mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge$. Indeed, since $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ it follows from 3.2 (b) that $\varepsilon_n^\wedge(\omega) \subseteq \varepsilon_n^\wedge(\mathcal{X})$, giving us that $\omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge$. Hence $\mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \mathcal{X}^\wedge$ and then $\mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge$ by 3.4 (b).

(a) Let $0 \in \omega$. By 5.4 (a) we have that $\mathcal{X}^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge[1]$, and therefore, by 3.2 (b) we get $\omega^\wedge[1] \subseteq \omega^\wedge$. But $\mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \mathcal{X}^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge$ by 3.4 (b), and then $\mathcal{X}^\wedge = \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge = \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge[1]$.

(b) Let $\mathcal{X}[-1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. By 5.4 (a) and the assertion above, we have $\mathcal{X}^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X}[-1] * \omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge$. On the other hand, from 5.4 (a), it follows that $\mathcal{X}^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge[1]$. So, to prove (b), it is enough to see that $\mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge[1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge$. Let $C \in \mathcal{X} * \omega^\wedge[1]$. Then there is a distinguished triangle $Y \to X \to C \to Y[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $Y \in \omega^\wedge$. Hence it follows that $C \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge$ since $\omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge$; proving (b). $\square$

We are now in position to prove that if ω is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator in a suitable class $\mathcal{X}$, then the $\omega^\wedge$-projective dimension coincides with the $\mathcal{X}$-resolution dimension for every object of the thick subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ generated by $\mathcal{X}$.

Theorem 5.6. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ which are closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$. If $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under extensions and ω is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$, then*

$$\mathrm{pd}_{\omega^\wedge}(C) = \mathrm{pd}_\omega(C) = \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(C), \quad \forall C \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge.$$

Proof. Let $C \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge$. By 4.2 (b) and the dual of 4.6 (a), it follows that $\mathrm{pd}_\omega(C) = \mathrm{id}_{\{C\}}(\omega) = \mathrm{id}_{\{C\}}(\omega^\wedge) = \mathrm{pd}_{\omega^\wedge}(C)$. To prove the last equality, we proceed by induction on $n := \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(C)$. To start with, we have $\mathrm{pd}_\omega(\mathcal{X}) = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega) = 0$. If $n = 0$ then $C \in \mathcal{X}$ and so $\mathrm{pd}_\omega(C) = 0 = \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(C)$.

Let $n = 1$. Then, we have a distinguished triangle $X_1 \to X_0 \to C \to X_1[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X_i \in \mathcal{X}$. By 5.4 (a), there is a distinguished triangle $Y_C \to X_C \overset{\varphi_C}{\to} C \to Y_C[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y_C \in \omega^\wedge$ and $X_C \in \mathcal{X}$. By the base change procedure, there exists a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & Y_C \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d] & Y_C \arrow[d] & \\
X_1 \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & E \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & X_C \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\varphi_C"'] & X_1[1] \arrow[d, equal] \\
X_1 \arrow[r] & X_0 \arrow[r, "\alpha"] \arrow[d] & C \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\beta"'] & X_1[1] \\
 & Y_C[1] \arrow[r, equal] & Y_C[1], &
\end{tikzcd}$$

where the rows and columns are distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$. Since $X_1, X_C \in \mathcal{X}$ it follows that $E \in \mathcal{X}$. On the other hand, since $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X, Y[1]) = 0$ for any $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $Y \in \omega^\wedge$ (see 5.2 (a)), we get that $\beta\alpha = 0$ and then the triangle

$Y_C \to E \to X_0 \to Y_C[1]$ splits getting us that $Y_C \in \mathcal{X} \cap \omega^\wedge = \omega$ (see 5.2). Using that $\mathrm{pd}_\omega(\mathcal{X}) = 0$ and 4.4 (a), we have that $\mathrm{pd}_\omega(C) \leq \mathrm{resdim}_\mathcal{X}(C) = 1$. We assert that $\mathrm{pd}_\omega(C) > 0$. Indeed, suppose that $\mathrm{pd}_\omega(C) = 0$; and then $\mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(C, W[1]) = 0$ for any $W \in \omega$. Since $Y_C \in \omega$ we get that $\beta = 0$ and hence the triangle $Y_C \to X_C \to C \to Y_C[1]$ splits. Therefore $C \in \mathcal{X}$ contradicting that $\mathrm{resdim}_\mathcal{X}(C) = 1$; proving that $\mathrm{pd}_\omega(C) = 1 = \mathrm{resdim}_\mathcal{X}(C)$.

Let $n \geq 2$. From 4.4 (a), we have that $\mathrm{pd}_\omega(C) \leq \mathrm{resdim}_\mathcal{X}(C) = n$ since $\mathrm{pd}_\omega(\mathcal{X}) = 0$. Then, it is enough to prove that $\mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(C[-n], -)|_\omega \neq 0$. Consider a distinguished triangle $K_1 \to X_0 \to C \to K_1[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $X_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathrm{resdim}_\mathcal{X}(K_1) = n-1 = \mathrm{pd}_\omega(K_1)$. Applying the functor $\mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(-, W[n])$, with $W \in \omega$, to the triangle $C \to K_1[1] \to X_0[1] \to C[1]$ we get the exact sequence of abelian groups

$$\mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(X_0[1], W[n]) \to \mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(K_1[1], W[n]) \to \mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(C, W[n]).$$

Suppose that $\mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(C[-n], -)|_\omega = 0$. Then $\mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(K_1[1], W[n]) = 0$ since $\mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(\omega) = 0$ and $n \geq 2$; contradicting that $\mathrm{pd}_\omega(K_1) = n-1$. □

Lemma 5.7. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ and $A \to B \to C \to A[1]$ a distinguished triangle in $\mathcal{T}$. Then*

(a) $\mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(B) \leq \max\{\mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(A), \mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(C)\}$;

(b) $\mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(A) \leq \max\{\mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(B), \mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(C)+1\}$;

(c) $\mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(C) \leq \max\{\mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(B), \mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(A)-1\}$.

Proof. It is straightforward. □

The following result gives a relationship between the relative injective dimensions, attached to the pair $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$, and the ω-coresolution dimension. Such a result will be applied in [15] to deal with co-t-structures. Observe that 5.8 is not the dual version of 5.6.

Proposition 5.8. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ such that $\omega \subseteq {}_\mathcal{X}\mathcal{U}$. If ω is closed under direct summands and $\mathcal{X}$-injective, then*

$$\mathrm{id}_\omega(C) = \mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(C) = \mathrm{coresdim}_\omega(C), \quad \forall\, C \in {}_\mathcal{X}\mathcal{U} \cap \omega^\vee.$$

Proof. Assume that ω is closed under direct summands and $\mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(\omega) = 0$. Let $C \in {}_\mathcal{X}\mathcal{U} \cap \omega^\vee$ and $n := \mathrm{coresdim}_\omega(C)$. By the dual of 4.4 (b), it follows

$$(*) \quad \alpha := \mathrm{id}_\omega(C) \leq \mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(C) = \mathrm{coresdim}_\omega(C) = n.$$

Moreover, since $C \in \omega^\vee$ there is a distinguished triangle $(\eta)\ :\ C \to W_0 \to K_1 \to C[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $W_0 \in \omega$ and $\mathrm{coresdim}_\omega(K_1) = n-1$. Furthermore, from 3.2 (a) we get that $K_1 \in {}_\mathcal{X}\mathcal{U}$ since ${}_\mathcal{X}\mathcal{U}$ is closed under cocones and $\omega \subseteq {}_\mathcal{X}\mathcal{U}$. Now, we prove the result by induction on α.

Let $\alpha = 0$. We assert that $C \in \omega$ (note that if this is true, then the result follows). We proceed by induction on n. If $n = 0$ it is clear that $C \in \omega$. So we may assume that $n > 0$, and then, applying 5.7 to (η) it follows that $\mathrm{id}_{\omega}(K_1)=0$. Hence by induction we get that $K_1\in\omega$, and so $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(K_1,C[1])=0$ since $\mathrm{id}_{\omega}(C)=0$. Therefore the triangle (η) splits and then $C\in\omega$; proving the assertion.

Assume that $\alpha>0$. Applying 5.7 to (η), we get that $\mathrm{id}_{\omega}(K_1)\leq\alpha-1$. Thus, by induction, it follows that $\mathrm{id}_{\omega}(K_1)=\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(K_1)=\mathrm{coresdim}_{\omega}(K_1)=n-1$. In particular, we obtain that $n-1\leq\alpha-1$ and hence by $(*)$ the result follows. □

The following result provides a characterization of $\omega^{\wedge}$ in terms of $\mathcal{X}$. From this, we get some nice relationship between other subcategories.

Proposition 5.9. *Let $(\mathcal{X},\omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ such that ω is closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$, $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under extensions and ω is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) ${}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1]\cap\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}=\omega^{\wedge}$.

(b) *If $\mathcal{X}[-1]\subseteq\mathcal{X}$ then $\mathcal{U}_{\omega}=\omega^{\wedge}=\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1]\cap\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$.*

Proof. (a) Let $C\in{}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1]\cap\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$. In particular, from 5.4 (a), there exists a distinguished triangle $Y_C\to X_C\to C\to Y_C[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y_C\in\omega^{\wedge}$ and $X_C\in\mathcal{X}$. We assert that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(X_C)=0$. Indeed, it follows from 5.7 (a) since $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C)=0=\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(Y_C)$ (see 4.2 and 5.2 (a)). Therefore, $X_C\in\mathcal{X}\cap{}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1]$ and by 5.2 (b), we get that $X_C\in\omega$ proving that $C\in\omega^{\wedge}$. On the other hand, since $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega^{\wedge})=0$, we have from 4.2 that $\omega^{\wedge}\subseteq{}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1]\cap\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$.

(b) Assume that $\mathcal{X}[-1]\subseteq\mathcal{X}$. Therefore, from (a), it follows that $\omega^{\wedge}=\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1]\cap\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$. Furthermore, since $\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1]$ is suspended and $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ is triangulated (see 3.5), we conclude that $\omega^{\wedge}$ is a suspended subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$; and so $\mathcal{U}_{\omega}\subseteq\omega^{\wedge}$. Finally, the equality $\mathcal{U}_{\omega}=\omega^{\wedge}$ follows from 3.6 (3). □

Theorem 5.10. *Let $(\mathcal{X},\omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ which are closed under direct summands, $\mathcal{X}$ be cosuspended and ω be an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$. Then,*

$$\varepsilon_n^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})=\mathcal{X}[n]=\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}\cap{}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\omega}[n+1]=\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}\cap{}^{\perp}(\omega^{\wedge})[n+1],\quad\forall n\geq 0.$$

Proof. From 3.5, we have that $\varepsilon_n^{\wedge}(\mathcal{X})=\mathcal{X}[n]$ and $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}=\cup_{n\geq 0}\mathcal{X}[n]$. On the other hand, by 4.2 and 5.6, it follows that

$$\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}\cap{}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\omega^{\wedge}}[n+1]=\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}\cap{}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\omega}[n+1]=\mathcal{X}[n]\cap\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}=\mathcal{X}[n].$$

Finally, since $\omega^{\wedge}$ is a suspended subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ (see 5.9 (b)), we have that ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\omega^{\wedge}}={}^{\perp}(\omega^{\wedge})$; proving the result. □

The previous results can be seen under the light of the so called torsion theories, in the sense of Iyama-Yoshino. Such torsion theories have been extensively studied in relation to the cluster theory (see [11]).

Definition 5.11. [11, Definition 2.2] *A pair $(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y})$ of subcategories of $\mathcal{T}$ is called a torsion theory in $\mathcal{T}$, if the following conditions hold.*

(a) *$\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ are closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$.*
(b) $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y})=0$.
(c) $\mathcal{T}=\mathcal{X}*\mathcal{Y}$.

Corollary 5.12. *Let $(\mathcal{X},\omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, which are closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$, and such that $\mathcal{X}$ is cosuspended and ω is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$. Then, the pair $(\mathcal{X},\omega^\wedge[1])$ is a torsion theory in the thick triangulated subcategory $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ of $\mathcal{T}$.*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{X}$ is cosuspended and closed under direct summands, we know from 3.5 (c) that $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ is a thick triangulated subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$. On the other hand, from 5.5, it follows that $\mathcal{X}^\wedge=\mathcal{X}*\omega^\wedge[1]$; and furthermore, $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X},\omega^\wedge[1])=0$ since ω is $\mathcal{X}$-injective. Finally, by 5.9, we get that $\omega^\wedge$ is a subcategory closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$. □

Definition 5.13. *For a given class $\mathcal{Y}$ of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, we set $\mathcal{Y}^\sim:=(\mathcal{Y}^\wedge)^\vee$.*

Lemma 5.14. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) *If $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ is closed under cocones then $\omega^\sim\subseteq\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ for any $\omega\subseteq\mathcal{X}$.*

(b) *$\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ is closed under cocones if and only if $\mathcal{X}^\wedge=\mathcal{X}^\sim$.*

(c) *If $\mathcal{X}^\wedge=\mathcal{X}^\sim$ then $\mathcal{X}^\wedge[-1]\subseteq\mathcal{X}^\wedge$.*

Proof. (a) Let $\omega\subseteq\mathcal{X}$ and assume that $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ is closed under cocones. Hence $\omega^\wedge\subseteq\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ and so by 3.6 (2), we conclude that $\omega^\sim\subseteq\mathcal{X}^\wedge$.

(b) Assume that $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ is closed under cocones. It is clear that $\mathcal{X}^\wedge\subseteq\mathcal{X}^\sim$. On the other hand, by (a) it follows that $\mathcal{X}^\sim\subseteq\mathcal{X}^\wedge$.

Suppose that $\mathcal{X}^\wedge=\mathcal{X}^\sim$. Let $A\to B\to C\to A[1]$ be a distinguished triangle in $\mathcal{T}$ with B,C in $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$. Then $A\in\mathcal{X}^\sim=\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ and so $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ is closed under cocones.

(c) Let $\mathcal{X}^\wedge=\mathcal{X}^\sim$ and consider $X\in\mathcal{X}^\wedge$. Since, we have the distinguished triangle $X[-1]\to 0\to X\xrightarrow{1_X}X$ and $0,X\in\mathcal{X}^\wedge$, it follows from (b) that $X[-1]\in\mathcal{X}^\wedge$; proving the lemma. □

Corollary 5.15. *Let $(\mathcal{X},\omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. If $\mathcal{X}$ is cosuspended and $\omega\subseteq\mathcal{X}$, then $\omega^\sim\subseteq\mathcal{X}^\wedge=\mathcal{X}^\sim$.*

Proof. It follows from 5.14 and the fact that $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ is triangulated (see 3.5). □

In case ω is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator in a cosuspended subcategory $\mathcal{X}$ of $\mathcal{T}$, both closed under direct summands, the thick subcategory $\overline{\Delta}_{\mathcal{T}}(\omega)$ of $\mathcal{T}$ can be characterized as follows.

Theorem 5.16. *Let $(\mathcal{X},\omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, $\mathcal{X}$ be cosuspended and ω be closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$. If ω is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$, the following statements hold.*

(a) $\omega^{\sim} = \{C \in \mathcal{X}^{\wedge} : \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) < \infty\} = \mathcal{X}^{\wedge} \cap (\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1])^{\vee}$.

(b) $\omega^{\sim}$ *is the smallest triangulated subcategory of* $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ *containing* ω, *that is* $\omega^{\sim} = \Delta_{\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}}(\omega)$.

(c) *If* $\mathcal{X}$ *is closed under direct summands in* $\mathcal{T}$, *then*

$$\overline{\Delta}_{\mathcal{T}}(\omega) = \omega^{\sim} = \overline{\Delta}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X}) \cap (\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1])^{\vee}.$$

Proof. Assume that $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{X}[-1] * \omega$ and $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega) = 0$. Let $\mathcal{Y} := \{C \in \mathcal{X}^{\wedge} : \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) < \infty\}$. We start by proving that $\omega^{\sim} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$. By 5.15, we know that $\omega^{\sim} \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$. On the other hand, since $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega^{\wedge}) = 0$ (see 5.2(a)), we can apply the dual of 4.4(a), and then $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) \leq \mathrm{coresdim}_{\omega^{\wedge}}(C) < \infty$ for any $C \in \omega^{\sim}$; proving that $\omega^{\sim} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$.
Let $C \in \mathcal{Y}$. By 5.4 (a), there is a distinguished triangle $C \to Y^C \to X^C \to C[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y^C \in \omega^{\wedge}$ and $X^C \in \mathcal{X}$. Hence, from 5.7 (c) we get that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(X^C) < \infty$ and then, by 5.3 $X^C \in \omega^{\vee} \subseteq \omega^{\sim}$; proving that $C \in \omega^{\sim}$. Hence $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \omega^{\sim}$. In order to get the second equality in (a), we use 4.2 and the fact that $\mathcal{X} = {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}$ to obtain

$$\{C \in \mathcal{X}^{\wedge} : \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) < \infty\} = \mathcal{X}^{\wedge} \cap (\cup_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-n-1]).$$

On the other hand, since $\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1]$ is suspended, then by the dual of 3.5, it follows that $(\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1])^{\vee} = \cup_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-n-1]$ and also that $(\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1])^{\vee}$ is a thick subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$. In particular, by 3.5, we get (b). Finally, (c) follows from (a) and 3.5. □

The following result will be applied in [15] to deal with co-t-structures. Also, it will be applied in Section 5, to get some connection with relative Rouquier's dimension.

Proposition 5.17. *Let* $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ *be a pair of classes of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$, $\mathcal{X}$ *co-suspended and* ω *closed under direct summands in* $\mathcal{T}$. *If* ω *is an* $\mathcal{X}$*-injective weak-cogenerator in* $\mathcal{X}$, *then*

(a) $\mathrm{id}_{\omega}(C) = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) < \infty, \quad \forall C \in \omega^{\sim}$;

(b) $\omega^{\sim} \cap {}_{\omega}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-n-1] = \omega^{\sim} \cap \mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-n-1], \quad \forall n \geq 0$.

Proof. (a) By 3.5 and 5.16, we know that $\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ and $\omega^{\sim}$ are triangulated subcategories of $\mathcal{T}$. Furthermore, from 5.15 it follows that $\omega^{\sim} \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$. Let $C \in \omega^{\sim}$. It is enough to prove that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) \leq \mathrm{id}_{\omega}(C)$. In order to do that, we will use induction on $n := \mathrm{id}_{\omega}(C)$.

Since $C \in \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$, we have from 5.4 the existence of a distinguished triangle $(\eta) \ : \ C \to Y^C \to X^C \to C[1]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Y^C \in \omega^{\wedge} \subseteq \omega^{\sim}$ and $X^C \in \mathcal{X}$. We assert that $X^C \in \mathcal{X} \cap \omega^{\vee}$. Indeed, using that $\omega^{\sim}$ is triangulated we conclude that $X^C \in \mathcal{X} \cap \omega^{\sim}$ and hence $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(X^C)$ is finite (see 5.16 (a)). Thus $X^C \in \mathcal{X} \cap \omega^{\vee}$ by 5.3; proving the assertion.

Let $n = 0$. Then $\mathrm{id}_\omega(X^C) = 0$ since $\mathrm{id}_\omega(Y^C) = 0$ (see 5.2 and 5.7). On the other hand, 5.8 gives the equalities $\mathrm{coresdim}_\omega(X^C) = \mathrm{id}_\omega(X^C) = 0$. Hence $X^C \in \omega$ and since $\mathrm{id}_\omega(C) = 0$, it follows that $\mathrm{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(X^C, C[1]) = 0$. Therefore, the triangle (η) splits giving us that C is a direct summand of Y^C, and hence $\mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(C) \leq \mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(Y^C) \leq \mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(\omega^\wedge) = 0$.

Assume that $n > 0$. Since $\mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(Y^C) = 0 = \mathrm{id}_\omega(Y^C)$, it follows from 5.7 that $\mathrm{id}_\omega(X^C) \leq n-1$. Hence, by induction $\mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(X^C) \leq \mathrm{id}_\omega(X^C) \leq n-1$. Therefore, applying again 5.7 to the triangle (η), we get that $\mathrm{id}_\mathcal{X}(C) \leq n = \mathrm{id}_\omega(C)$; proving the result.

(b) By 4.2, the item (a) and the fact that ${}_\mathcal{X}\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{X}$ the result follows. □

6. Some connection with Rouquier's dimension

In this section, we introduce some kind of "relative Rouquier's dimension"; and relate it with the Rouquier's dimension and the other relative dimensions developed in this paper.

Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be classes of objects in a triangulated category $\mathcal{T}$. Consider the smallest subcategory $\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle$ of $\mathcal{T}$ containing $\mathcal{X}$, closed under shifts, finite direct sums and direct summands, that is, $\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle := \mathrm{add}\,(\cup_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}\, \mathcal{X}[i])$. Let $\mathcal{X} \Diamond \mathcal{Y} := \langle \mathcal{X} * \mathcal{Y} \rangle$. Following R. Rouquier, we inductively define $\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_0 := 0$ and $\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_n := \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_{n-1} \Diamond \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle$ for $n \geq 1$. The objects of $\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_n$ are the direct summands of the objects obtained by taking a n-fold extension of finite direct sums of shifts of objects of $\mathcal{X}$.

The following dimension for triangulated categories was introduced by R. Rouquier and has been extensively studied in [17].

Definition 6.1. [17, Definition 3.2] *Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a triangulated category. The dimension of $\mathcal{T}$ is*

$$\dim(\mathcal{T}) := \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid \textit{there exists } X \in \mathcal{T} \textit{ such that } \langle X \rangle_{n+1} = \mathcal{T}\}.$$

Lemma 6.2. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a class of objects in a triangulated category $\mathcal{T}$. Then, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the following statements hold.*

(a) $\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_{n+1} = \langle \varepsilon_n^\wedge(\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle) \rangle = \langle \varepsilon_n^\vee(\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle) \rangle$.

(b) $\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_n \subseteq \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_{n+1}$.

Proof. (a) By induction over n, it can be seen that $\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_{n+1} = \left\langle *_{i=1}^{n+1} \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle \right\rangle$. On the other hand, from 3.2 (b), we have $\varepsilon_n^\wedge(\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle) = *_{i=0}^{n} \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle [i] = *_{i=1}^{n+1} \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle$ since $\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle [i] = \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle$ for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}$; proving that $\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_{n+1} = \langle \varepsilon_n^\wedge(\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle) \rangle$. Similarly, by the dual of 3.2 (b), it follows that $\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_{n+1} = \langle \varepsilon_n^\vee(\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle) \rangle$.

(b) It follows from (a) and 3.2 (c), since $0 \in \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle$. □

We now introduce the relative Rouquier's dimension as follows.

Definition 6.3. *Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a triangulated category, $\mathcal{X}$ a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ and $M \in \mathcal{T}$. The $\mathcal{X}$-dimension of M is*

$$\dim_{\mathcal{X}}(M) := \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \textit{ such that } M \in \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_{n+1}\}.$$

For a class $\mathcal{Y}$ of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, we set $\dim_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) := \sup\{\dim_{\mathcal{X}}(Y) \ : \ Y \in \mathcal{Y}\}$.

Lemma 6.4. *Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a triangulated category, and $\mathcal{X}$, $\mathcal{Y}$ be classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) *For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\dim_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) \leq n$ if and only if $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_{n+1}$.*

(b) *If $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$ then $\dim_{\mathcal{Y}}(M) \leq \dim_{\mathcal{X}}(M) \ \ \forall \, M \in \mathcal{T}$.*

Proof. (a) Let $\dim_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) \leq n$. Hence, for all $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, we have $m(Y) := \dim_{\mathcal{X}}(Y) \leq n$. Therefore, from 6.2 (b), it follows that $Y \in \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_{m(Y)+1} \subseteq \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_{n+1}$; proving that $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_{n+1}$. Finally, assume that $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_{n+1}$. So, it follows directly that $\dim_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) \leq n$.

(b) Let $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$ and $M \in \mathcal{T}$. Thus $\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle \subseteq \langle \mathcal{Y} \rangle$ and hence $*_{i=1}^{n} \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle \subseteq *_{i=1}^{n} \langle \mathcal{Y} \rangle \subseteq \langle *_{i=1}^{n} \langle \mathcal{Y} \rangle \rangle = \langle \mathcal{Y} \rangle_n$. Therefore $\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_n \subseteq \langle \mathcal{Y} \rangle_n$ and so we get that $\dim_{\mathcal{Y}}(M) \leq \dim_{\mathcal{X}}(M)$. □

Now, the relative Rouquier's dimension is related to the Rouquier's dimension as follows.

Proposition 6.5. *Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a triangulated category. Then,*

$$\dim(\mathcal{T}) = \min\{\dim_X(\mathcal{T}) \ : \ X \in \mathcal{T}\}.$$

Proof. From 6.4 (a), we can write down the following equalities

$$\begin{aligned} \dim(\mathcal{T}) &= \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid \text{there exists } X \in \mathcal{T} \text{ such that } \langle X \rangle_{n+1} = \mathcal{T}\} \\ &= \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid \text{there exists } X \in \mathcal{T} \text{ such that } \dim_X(\mathcal{T}) \leq n\} \\ &= \min\{\dim_X(\mathcal{T}) \ : \ X \in \mathcal{T}\}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

The following are some relationships between relative Rouquier's dimension and the other relative dimensions as coresolution, resolution, relative projective and relative injective dimension.

Proposition 6.6. *Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a triangulated category, $\mathcal{X}$ a class of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ and $M \in \mathcal{T}$. Then, we have that*

$$\dim_{\mathcal{X}}(M) \leq \min\{\mathrm{resdim}_{\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle}(M), \mathrm{coresdim}_{\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle}(M)\}.$$

Proof. From 6.2 (a), we have the inclusions $\varepsilon_n^{\wedge}(\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle) \subseteq \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_{n+1}$ and $\varepsilon_n^{\vee}(\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle) \subseteq \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_{n+1}$. Hence the result follows. □

Proposition 6.7. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a pair of classes of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ which are closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$. If $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under extensions and ω is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective weak-cogenerator in $\mathcal{X}$, then*

$$\dim_{\mathcal{X}}(C) \leq \mathrm{pd}_{\omega}(C) < \infty, \quad \forall \, C \in \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}.$$

Proof. It follows from 6.6 and 5.6, since $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle$. $\square$

Proposition 6.8. *Let* $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ *be a pair of classes of objects in* $\mathcal{T}$ *which are closed under direct summands in* $\mathcal{T}$*. If* $\mathcal{X}$ *is cosuspended and* ω *is an* $\mathcal{X}$*-injective weak-cogenerator in* $\mathcal{X}$*, then*

$$\dim_{\omega}(C) \leq \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) = \mathrm{id}_{\omega}(C) < \infty, \quad \forall\, C \in \omega^{\vee}.$$

Proof. By 5.17, we know that $\mathrm{id}_{\omega}(C) = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) < \infty$ for any $C \in \omega^{\sim}$. On the other hand, from 5.2 (b), it follows that $\omega = {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U} \cap {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}^{\perp}[-1]$ since $\mathcal{X} = {}_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{U}$. In particular, the dual of 4.4 (b) holds (take $\mathcal{Y} := \omega$) and hence $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) = \mathrm{coresdim}_{\omega}(C)$ for any $C \in \omega^{\vee}$. Observe that $\omega^{\vee} \subseteq \omega^{\sim}$ since $\omega^{\sim}$ is the smallest triangulated subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ containing ω (see 5.16 (b)). Therefore $\mathrm{id}_{\omega}(C) = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(C) < \infty$ for any $C \in \omega^{\vee}$. Finally, from 6.6, we get that $\dim_{\omega}(C) \leq \mathrm{coresdim}_{\omega}(C)$ since $\omega \subseteq \langle \omega \rangle$, proving the result. $\square$

In what follows, $\mathcal{T}$ is assumed to be a k-linear, Hom-finite triangulated and Krull-Schmidt category over a fixed field k; and $\mathcal{C}$ is a Krull-Schmidt subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ which is closed under direct summands in $\mathcal{T}$. It is said that $\mathcal{C}$ is n-cluster tilting (see [13]) if it is functorially finite and $\mathcal{C} = \cap_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathcal{C}[-i]^{\perp} = \cap_{i=1}^{n-1} {}^{\perp}\mathcal{C}[i]$.

The following is an example of a triangulated category $\mathcal{T}$ having finite $\mathcal{C}$-dimension.

Proposition 6.9. *Let* $\mathcal{C}$ *be a* n*-cluster tilting subcategory of* $\mathcal{T}$*. Then,*

$$\dim_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{T}) \leq \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{T}) \leq n-1.$$

Proof. From [11, Theorem 3.1], we know that $\mathcal{T} = *_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{C}[i]$. Therefore, by 3.2 (b), we conclude that $\mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{T}) \leq n-1$. Finally, by 6.6, it follows that $\dim_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{T}) \leq \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{T})$ since $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \langle \mathcal{C} \rangle$; proving the result. $\square$

Acknowledgment The authors are very grateful to the referee for the comments, corrections and suggestions.

REFERENCES

[1] L. Angeleri Hügel, O. Mendoza. Homological dimensions in cotorsion pairs. *Illinois J. Math.* 53, no1 (2009), 251-263.

[2] M. Auslander, R.O. Buchweitz. The Homological theory of maximal Cohen-Macaulay approximations. *Societe Mathematique de France* 38 (1989), 5-37.

[3] M. Auslander, I. Reiten. Applications of contravariantly finite subcategories. *Advances in Math.* 86 (1991), 111-152.

[4] M. Auslander, S. O. Smalo. Preprojective modules over artin algebra. *J. Algebra* 66 (1980), 61-122.

[5] A. A. Beilinson, J. Bernstein, P. Deligne. Faisceaux pervers. *Asterisque* 100 (1982).

[6] M. V. Bondarko. Weight structures for triangulated categories: weight filtrations, weight spectral sequences and weight complexes, applications to motives and to the stable homotopy category. Preprint available at http://arxiv.org/abs/0704.4003v1

[7] A. B. Buan. Subcategories of the derived category and cotilting complexes. *Colloq. Math.* 88 (2001), no. 1, 1-11.
[8] A. Beligiannis, I. Reiten. Homological and homotopical aspects of torsion theories. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* 188 (2007) no. 883.
[9] E. Enochs. Injective and flat covers, envelopes and resolvents. *Israel J. Math.* 39 (1981), 189-209.
[10] M. Hashimoto. Auslander-Buchweitz approximations of equivariant modules. *LMS, Lecture Notes Series* 282 (2000) Cambridge University Press.
[11] O. Iyama, Y. Yoshino. Mutation in triangulated categories and rigid Cohen-Macaulay modules. *Invent. math.* 172,(2008), 117-168.
[12] H. Krause. Derived categories, resolutions, and Brown representability. Notes of a Course at the Summer School Interactions between Homotopy Theory and Algebra. Chicago, July 2004
[13] B. Keller, I. Reiten. Cluster tilted algebras are Gorenstein and stably Calabi-Yau. *Adv. Math.* 211(1), 123-151, (2007).
[14] O. Mendoza, C. Sáenz. Tilting categories with applications to stratifying systems. *Journal of Algebra,* 302 (2006) 419-449.
[15] O. Mendoza, C. Sáenz, V. Santiago, M. J. Souto Salorio. Auslander-Buchwetiz context and co-t-structures. *Preprint available at* arXiv:1002.3926v3 (2011)
[16] D. Pauksztello. Compact corigid objects in triangulated categories and co-t-structures. *Cent. Eur. J. Math.* 6 (2008), no. 1, 25-42.
[17] R. Rouquier. Dimension of triangulated categories. *K-Theory* 1 (2008), 193-256.

Octavio Mendoza Hernández:
Instituto de Matemáticas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
Circuito Exterior, Ciudad Universitaria, C.P. 04510, México, D.F. MEXICO.
`omendoza@matem.unam.mx`

Edith Corina Sáenz Valadez:
Departamento de Matemáticas, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
Circuito Exterior, Ciudad Universitaria, C.P. 04510, México, D.F. MEXICO.
`ecsv@lya.fciencias.unam.mx`

Valente Santiago Vargas:
Instituto de Matemáticas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
Circuito Exterior, Ciudad Universitaria, C.P. 04510, México, D.F. MEXICO.
`valente@matem.unam.mx`

María José Souto Salorio:
Facultade de Informática, Universidade da Coruña
15071 A Coruña, ESPAÑA.
`mariaj@udc.es`